

J. Henry Smith, of Sedro Woolley, Wash., to be register of the land office at Seattle, Wash., vice Edward P. Tremper, term expired.

William E. Chaplin, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Cheyenne, Wyo., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 29, 1902.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

William H. Moody, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of the Navy.

CONSUL.

Rufus Waterman, of Rhode Island, to be consul of the United States at Dublin, Ireland.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. Edmond C. Chaytor, of South Carolina, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Frederick G. Dodge, of Massachusetts, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Charles T. Stanton, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for the district of Stonington, in the State of Connecticut.

John Peterson, of Minnesota, to be collector of customs for the district of Minnesota, in the State of Minnesota.

POSTMASTERS.

Dwight A. Dawson, to be postmaster at Reno, in the county of Washoe and State of Nevada.

Stephen F. Kelley, to be postmaster at San Bernardino, in the county of San Bernardino and State of California.

Sarah J. Hebson, to be postmaster at Sylacauga, in the county of Talladega and State of Alabama.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, April 29, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

OMNIBUS PUBLIC BUILDING BILL.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 227.

Resolved, That on the 29th day of April, 1902, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14018) entitled "A bill to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," and after three hours of general debate the Committee of the Whole shall rise and the chairman shall report the bill; whereupon, without debate or intervening motion, the vote shall be taken on engrossment and third reading of the bill and (if the bill shall have passed to be engrossed and read a third time) on the final passage.

The following amendments recommended by the Committee on Rules were read:

Page 1, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "on the 29th day of April, 1902." Page 1, lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "reading of the Journal" and insert "adoption of this resolution."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, if this rule shall be adopted, immediately on its adoption the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the omnibus public building bill, and after three hours' debate rise and report the bill to the House, and thereupon a vote will be taken on its passage.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. DALZELL. I will. What time does the gentleman want?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. About fifteen minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. I will yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I do not expect to use that much time, Mr. Speaker, and I will yield some of it to gentlemen on this side, if they desire it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose this rule with the expectation of defeating it. There is no politics to this bill.

Mr. CREAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order. I believe it will be too late after we have debated the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CREAMER. My point of order is based on what I find in the Constitution, Manual and Digest, which is supposed to govern us to a certain degree. It is much more material, Mr. Speaker, that there should be a rule to go by than what that rule is. I

maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this report suspends Rule X, which permits the offering of amendments to all questions brought before the House, and under Rule XXVIII to suspend that rule requires a two-thirds vote. Am I correct in that proposition?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not correct.

Mr. CREAMER. Then I will appeal from the decision of the Chair—

The SPEAKER. The question has been fought out again and again, and is well settled that the Committee on Rules can bring in a rule providing for order of business in the House—

Mr. CREAMER. Has it been settled in this House, Mr. Speaker, in the Fifty-seventh Congress?

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. CREAMER. When was the decision rendered?

The SPEAKER. There have been many decisions that a rule from the Committee on Rules, which fixes the order of business, with the approval of the House, does not require a two-thirds vote.

Mr. CREAMER. I raise the point that it does require a two-thirds vote, in accordance with the rule I find here, as it goes beyond fixing the order of business, and I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order, and from that decision the gentleman from New York appeals to the judgment of the House, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to lay that appeal on the table. The question before the House is, Shall the appeal be laid on the table?

The question was taken, and the motion of Mr. DALZELL to lay the appeal on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CREAMER. Most of the gentlemen upon this side, as well as on the other side of the House, would seem to have pork in the barrel. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my friend from New York [Mr. CREAMER] is mistaken in his last remark, in which he said that "all had pork in the barrel." Speaking for one, I will say that I have no "pork in the barrel." I am utterly and irreconcilably opposed to the adoption of this rule—not because I have no "pork in the barrel" (for I did not ask to have any in it). I have not asked for any public building at this session of Congress in my district, and therefore in opposing this rule I am not influenced by reason of the rejection of an application for a building.

But, sir, I am eternally opposed to this method of legislation. It can not be justified by any kind or course of reasoning or argument. We are here near the middle of the session. We have ample time to consider public-building bills. Mr. Speaker, for more than a hundred years, in the history of Congress, bills of this kind have been considered separately. It is a very modern, a very recent idea that we can not consider public-building bills upon their merits, and that each bill to construct a public building can not be allowed to stand upon its own merits, if it has any. I think this is the second bill of this kind that I have ever seen considered in the House of Representatives.

Now, sir, this form of legislation is wrong—radically wrong. Under the pending rule, no gentleman is to be permitted to offer an amendment to increase the amount of an appropriation for a public building, and no man is to be permitted to move to reduce the amount proposed by the committee. All must accept the action of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Their judgment must be taken as infallible.

Mr. Speaker, I care not how wise the committee may be; I care not how wise the gentlemen are who compose that committee, and I mean no reflection upon the committee or any member of it when I say it, but it is absolutely impossible that those 17 gentlemen can know with mathematical precision what amount is required for each of the public buildings for which an appropriation is recommended in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have not had time to read the report on the bill. It was not here yesterday. It was only delivered to us this morning. I have not had time to glance over its contents, but I find that it is a report of 12 or 13 pages. I presume it undertakes to give the arguments in favor of each one of these appropriations. I do not know that that is what is contained in this report; but I find that it refers to several of these public buildings. The bill provides a method or plan for procuring sites, and also defines, with at least some degree of detail, the manner of expending the appropriations made. Whether these provisions are wise or unwise no one here can tell.

Mr. Speaker, it is futile to stand here and object to this measure. I take it for granted that before the bill was reported enough promises were obtained, enough "pork" was put into "the barrel" to guarantee the passage of the bill. It may be right that it should pass. I can not controvert it. I have not had the time, and no gentleman outside of the committee has had

the time to investigate the particular items of this bill, and yet we are called upon to vote for it in gross, to vote for it as one bill, to vote for it without amendment, to vote for it without the opportunity of offering an amendment, and thus we are to take \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000 out of the Treasury or reject the bill, and thereby vote that no appropriation shall be made for any public building anywhere.

That is the position in which we are placed. It is not right, Mr. Speaker. With all the time we have—with the session only about half gone—we could take up each one of these propositions as it was the custom to do for a hundred years of our history; we could consider each public-building measure upon its merit and then pass it, either as reported or as amended by the Committee of the Whole.

I have not taken the floor for the purpose of attempting to bring united party action against this bill. It is not a partisan measure; it is not a political measure; but it is one, I repeat, that is radically wrong in its construction, radically wrong in the methods to be pursued for its passage. For one I shall vote against the rule, although I shall not seek to defeat it by calling the yeas and nays. I recognize that it would not be possible to defeat the rule. All I have taken the floor to do is to protest in the name of good legislation against the rule which we are now considering.

I yield five minutes to my colleague [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] whether he will yield for an amendment striking out so much of this proposed rule as provides that there shall be no amendments offered to the bill.

Mr. DALZELL. I can not.

Mr. SIMS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this bill being considered, and no objection, in general, to a rule providing for its consideration; but it does seem to me that it is carrying things to an extreme pass when we can not offer an amendment to an omnibus bill containing numerous items—a bill which the House has had no opportunity to consider and will have no opportunity to consider.

I want to say that, so far as I know, I have no amendments to offer to increase any item in the bill, but there are some items in the bill which I would move to amend by decreasing. In the interest of economy in public expenditures I can not see what it is that has appealed to the Committee on Rules in this House to report a rule providing for the consideration of a bill involving many millions in such a way that it can not be considered in Committee of the Whole by paragraphs and shall not be open to amendments.

It seems to me that is a surrender of the powers of this House which is dangerous in the extreme and which no consideration should prevail upon any member to indorse. I have no objection to the rule if we are permitted to amend, but I want to ask this House, Mr. Speaker, why should the House upon this particular bill be denied the privilege which it exercises on other bills of like character? The river and harbor bill is considered here item by item, with amendments pro and con offered and voted upon. The omnibus war claims bill, reported from the committee of which I have the honor to be a member, is considered in the same way. Now, why is this bill so sacred? Are these appropriations so sacred and is the committee which has considered it so wise that the provisions of the bill must not even be inquired into in this House? Why have three hours of general debate on a bill that can not be amended one way or the other? Why these three hours? If it is a bill so good that it can not be improved by amendment, how can it be improved by general debate? What is the use of general debate?

The House knows in the repeal of the war-revenue taxes that on account of amendments being denied by the special rule it was asked to have no general debate and put the bill upon its immediate passage and it met with the universal approval of the country. Why give three hours now to talk about provisions of a bill which we know is going to pass without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t"? Omnibus bills are bad enough in their nature when the House has the liberty to consider them in Committee of the Whole with power to amend them, but how much worse do they become when the voice of the House is to be stifled and the House yield to the committee, its servant, its sovereign power to change or amend. I make no reflection upon this committee; they are all my personal friends, and I am not making one particle of complaint personally in regard to the matter; but why should this committee or its action be selected out and dignified with this decree, behind which it is impossible to go, to inquire, to alter, or to amend?

Why not take the omnibus war-claims bill and treat it in the same way? Why not take the river and harbor bill and treat it in the same way? Why not take the naval appropriation bill which is now before the House and treat it in the same way? Whenever the servant of this House has become supreme, then the rules of which this side has complained so much become ex-

tremely dangerous. I hope my Democratic friends who have something in this bill will not vote in violation of every principle and doctrine which they have ever maintained simply for fear they will not get justice. I presume every appropriation in this bill is a proper one. As far as I know, it is. Therefore, what reason is there for us to surrender our rights in order to pass a just bill?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] has two minutes remaining.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I will only use a moment of that time in order to emphasize what my colleague has said, that I can see no use in having three hours general debate upon this bill. I ask my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] what can be accomplished by a general debate of three hours here upon this bill? What is the object of the three hours' debate? If we go into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and have general debate, with gentlemen to speak on the state of the Union, that is well enough, but I can not see what good is to be accomplished by three hours of general debate upon the pending measure, with no opportunity to amend. We are to have no right to amend, no right to reduce or to increase any proposition in the bill or to strike out any proposition or insert a new one, yet we are to stand here and speak for three hours. Now, if the proposition were, I say, to go into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and have general debate I can see that some good might be accomplished. That is all I care to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MERCER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has had under consideration before it over 400 bills authorizing public-building legislation. The aggregate of the amounts asked by those bills foot up almost \$67,000,000. The committee realizes that the United States is a growing country and has attempted, as far as possible, to relieve the situation in different parts of the Republic in an economical and systematic way. The committee regret exceedingly that it was impossible to recognize all bills before it, but there are other Congresses to come. It is impossible for one Congress, and especially one session of Congress, to meet all the wants of this great country of ours. We have prepared a bill, after very careful investigation and consideration, which we think upon investigation by the members of this House will meet with almost unanimous approval.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MERCER. I do yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Does the gentleman from Nebraska think that the provision in the bill reported by the committee relating to the post-office in New York will give to New York City a post-office within the time in which that great city ought to have one?

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from New York, permit me to say that the three gentlemen from the city of New York who have made the most fuss upon the floor of this House about a public building in the city of New York have done more to retard that measure and have done less to give the city of New York any relief whatever than any other members upon the floor of this House; and if the committee had depended upon the three members referred to, who have occupied the time of this House, for information as to the situation in New York, nothing would have been reported by the committee with reference to that city. These three gentlemen have occupied the time of this House in giving data and evidence and information about the condition of affairs in the city of New York, and not one of them ever came before the committee and offered us a single line of evidence why we should do anything in the city of New York, and were it not for Representative GILLET, a member of the committee, and Messrs. McCLELLAN, CUMMINGS, SULZER, DOUGLAS, and other distinguished gentlemen from the State and city of New York who came to us and gave us this evidence the committee would not have been justified in even recognizing the city of New York in this bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield further to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MERCER. I gladly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Did not the entire delegation from New York wait upon the gentleman from Nebraska and implore him to report a bill for the construction of a post-office in New York, and did not the Representatives from New York in the House, when in Committee of the Whole, discussing the Post-Office appropriation bill, and in the gentleman's own room and elsewhere,

furnish the gentleman from Nebraska and his committee with statistics showing the absolute necessity for the erection of a post-office in the city of New York?

Mr. MERCER. In reply to the gentleman, permit me to say that the gentleman who is now addressing the House and the other gentleman from New York [Mr. CREAMER] never gave us a line of evidence or a line of information upon which we should act in the committee. They made all their speeches upon the floor of the House, and took good care to make their speeches when I happened to be absent and when other members of the committee were absent from the floor of the House. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the city of New York has been treated magnificently in this bill.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What! [Laughter.]

Mr. MERCER. Why, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does not know that New York City is mentioned in the bill, apparently.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Oh, yes, I do; but in what way?

Mr. MERCER. We have authorized a commission, consisting of the Postmaster-General, the Attorney-General of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury, to select a site in the city of New York, in Manhattan borough. That commission must take its time and hear all the evidence and information and plans with reference to a building in that city before a site can be purchased. It is not a simple matter to purchase a site in the great city of New York. It may be expensive, and the location must satisfy certain conditions. These three men must decide as to those conditions. Now, it is utterly impossible to construct a building in New York or elsewhere without first obtaining a site, and it will take from six months to two years to buy this site, let this commission work as faithfully as they may. The committee in this bill also aids New York by adding \$1,000,000 to the limit of cost of the custom-house in that city.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield further?

Mr. MERCER. No; I do not yield any further.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska declines to yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MERCER. I desire to say, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I think this bill will meet with the approval of this House almost unanimously, as I said before, and we court investigation. I think the bill will be passed almost unanimously. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL and Mr. GOLDFOGLE rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DALZELL. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The question being taken on the adoption of the resolution as amended, on a division (demanded by Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee) there were—ayes 166, noes 33.

Mr. SIMS. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were refused, 16 members (not a sufficient number) rising in support of the demand therefor.

So the resolution as amended was agreed to.

And then, on motion of Mr. MERCER, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14018) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes, with Mr. GROSVENOR in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 14018, pursuant to the special order of the House.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. MERCER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MERCER. Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to arrive at a fair distribution of the three hours, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. BANKHEAD, control one half of the time and myself the balance.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. You are both on the same side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that one-half of the time allotted for general debate be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and one-half by the gentleman from Nebraska, chairman of the committee. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to object. I want to say that both these gentlemen are upon the

same side of the question, and it is not usual for gentlemen on the same side to control all the time.

Mr. MERCER. I thought there was but one side to this question. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It seems so; although 30 gentlemen voted against it.

Mr. MERCER. I will say to the gentleman there will be no trouble about time.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I am not objecting to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] controlling the time; but several gentlemen have asked for time, and all who have asked it are opposed to the bill. I have no doubt the gentleman from Alabama will yield them time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to say that I have already agreed to yield time to two gentlemen on this question, and they are both opposed to this bill; and I apprehend that every gentleman who asks for time on this side will get it, because there will be but very few who are opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MERCER. I yield forty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, fully understanding that no ultimate good could be accomplished by so doing, as the matter had practically to be fought out in the committee, I have heretofore refrained from making any special remarks relative to any of the anticipated provisions for the interests of New York City which would be incorporated in the bill of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds until such measure was before the House for discussion, and even now I shall endeavor to state my views briefly and to the point.

I desire first to thoroughly indorse and say that I am in full accord with the statements that have been made by other gentlemen from New York City in regard to the absolute needs and requirements of our metropolis for a new uptown post-office building. Also that I fully agree and stand with them in the condemnation and repudiation of the criticism which one New York paper especially has seen fit to mete out to us, wishing to make it appear that we have been lukewarm and derelict in our duty toward the public and not mindful of the wishes of our city in this particular, nor appreciative of the great need for prompt extra postal facilities.

I believe that from the start of this session every man representing the city of New York on this floor has been in full sympathy with the object in view, and that they have done everything in their power to arrive at a proper conclusion of the question, and are still prepared to act in any manner which may benefit New York by securing necessary relief.

It does not require any flight of oratory, long speeches, or statistics, in my judgment, to show the absolute necessities of our city and prove that our needs for a new uptown post-office are urgent and imperative. It is not merely a local question, nor are we looking at it from any selfish standpoint, or desire it to satisfy our own pride, but it is a measure for the benefit of the whole country, and as much their interests as it is ours, as with the present cramped facilities and for the want of proper space to do the work beyond doubt the forwarding of mails rapidly and expeditiously as should be done is not possible. The employees are also called upon to work at a great disadvantage in the basement and other parts of the building not originally intended for that purpose.

The present post-office was built some twenty-five years ago, and our city and the country has nearly doubled in population since. We have also increased largely in intelligence, and letter writing has developed in a most wonderful degree—far beyond the proportionate increase based on population. During the past quarter of a century ten or fifteen millions of aliens have also come to this country, thus increasing enormously the foreign mails, and especially to Europe and nearby countries.

The immense growth of our import and export business has necessitated our merchants to increase rapidly their foreign correspondence, and it has expanded several hundred per cent during the period under discussion.

We must not overlook, as well, the through mail service, thousands of bags of letters and papers reaching our shores almost daily from China, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippine Islands, and other sections of the great East, now developing so rapidly, entering our portals at San Francisco, crossing the continent, and required to be handled in New York City, which is the great outlet for all foreign correspondence.

Then again we must not forget to mention the introduction of the typewriter, supplemented by the employment of stenographers, as practically all our business houses throughout the land, as well as many of our homes, are now enjoying these advantages, thus enabling a man or a woman to write probably a hundred letters a day, where previously by the pen and hand likely not more than

one-third or one-fourth of this number would have been sent out. All these combination of facts have so overtaxed our present facilities that it has become absolutely necessary for us to ask of Congress a generous and prompt response to our needs.

A special bill was introduced by our senior Senator and passed by the Senate for this purpose; and believing fully in the justice of our request, I should have preferred a special bill also to have come before the House, as immediate relief is what is required, and I do not believe that anyone on this floor would not have recognized our necessities and gladly have accorded us consideration. But there was a division of opinion on this matter even among the New York Representatives themselves.

It was then considered that an appropriation for a site and building with a New York commission was desirable; but finally, after a comprehensive discussion of the entire issue and its merits, the present provisions have been thought more feasible and perhaps more to the ultimate advantage of our city, and I wish to say here that, having followed the matter up closely, and practically weekly, I always found the chairman, the gentleman from New York State on the committee, and others desirous of doing what is right by our city and agreeable to our wants having proper consideration.

It is not often that more is granted than is asked for in matters of this kind, but let us look at the question for a moment from this point of view. The postmaster in New York City, as I understand, was anxious to have a building with light and ventilation, large floor space, and accessibility, but so that this could be secured quickly he was not so particular as to the building itself. It is evident, however, that by the provisions we shall now secure even more, as the commission are instructed to obtain a site accessible by streets on all four sides, thus insuring large space, plenty of light and air; and practically this provision means an entire city block, or its equivalent.

It further means that, having obtained a grand site, which this will give us, that we should also secure a building commensurate in importance to the site; and I do not question whatever that when the committee reports to this House, as they are called upon to do—and their instructions to purchase, I should say, are mandatory—that Congress will then willingly grant us a proper appropriation for a building which will be a credit and ornament to the city, and that we shall secure a splendid edifice which will be a pleasure to our citizens and those who visit us from other parts of the country and our foreign friends, and that we will hear no more of a single-story building, which would be entirely inadequate.

The original intention was to have New York men on the commission, but perhaps with wisdom, as it will avoid any possible criticism as to the selection of a site this has been changed, and the commission as named is composed of three upright gentlemen at the head of the most important departments of our Government, and as they will be able easily to obtain all the information they require as to the best likely position for the new building, we can undoubtedly intrust this matter safely to them, although I still believe it might have been well to have had one New Yorker on the commission, say the president of the chamber of commerce.

It is possible that the securing of final relief for New York under the provisions outlined may take somewhat longer, but it also seems clear that we shall ultimately benefit very much by the slight delay, and I think that people in New York City, upon giving the matter consideration, will be satisfied that they have been treated well, considering all the circumstances, and I will point out as well that the commission is not restricted as to the value of the site they are to purchase.

While speaking in connection with this bill I wish also to say just a few words in regard to another important issue which has not, I believe, been mentioned heretofore, and that is the New York custom-house.

I introduced a bill in connection with the completion of this building and have followed the matter up and am pleased to say that the present measure carries an extra appropriation of \$1,000,000 toward this object, and the building can probably be finally finished at an expenditure of one and a half millions, which amount we hope to finally secure. I would explain in relation to this appropriation that the building was originally intended to be only five stories in height and built of granite and limestone, also that the offices provided were for the collector, the surveyor, and the naval officer. It has since been deemed desirable that room would also be furnished for the down-town branch of the post-office, and accommodation for the collector of internal revenue, second division, and for the department or board of light-house inspectors, thus saving annually a large amount of money in rental for the Government.

This has necessitated increasing the height of the building by the addition of an extra story. When the building is completed the rental saved will be, for the collector's office, \$130,000; naval

office, \$16,500; internal-revenue office, \$7,500; and branch post-office, \$6,000, or a total of \$160,000, which amount is now being paid out yearly.

It has further been decided, and most wisely, to finish the building entirely of granite, so that we may have a strong and imposing structure which will be worthy of our city, and the site the building occupies, rather than having a building which would be imposing up to the third story and gaudy and cheap on the upper floors.

The New York custom-house is splendidly situated at the end of Broadway, facing north toward that grand avenue, overlooking Bowling Green, a small park. On the east it overlooks the fine building of the New York Produce Exchange; on the west, Battery Park, and on the south the magnificent buildings of the Cheesborough Company. It occupies an entire city block, and has light and ventilation on all sides, also access. Therefore, reviewing these provisions of the bill, it seems that, after all, New York does not fare so badly.

We are granted for our new custom-house a million dollars to a million and a half. We will obtain a fine site for our new up-town post-office at probably a cost of not less than \$2,000,000, and finally a likely further expenditure of one or more millions for the building when we come to Congress asking their indulgence in this matter.

I therefore feel that we should accept in good faith the provisions as named in the bill, and believe that the people of New York will be well satisfied with what has been accomplished after giving the matter proper attention. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FEELY].

Mr. FEELY. Mr. Chairman, in opposing this bill I have no criticism to make of the committee except that I deprecate their judgment. On December 10, 1901, I introduced a bill for a public building at Oak Park, Ill., the appropriation proposed being \$35,000. The same identical bill, without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i," was introduced by my predecessor in the previous Congress, Mr. Lorimer. I introduced that bill at the request of many of the leading citizens of the village of Oak Park. The representations that were made to me as to the desirability of this appropriation were such as could not be gainsaid. Subsequently, on the 4th of February, in response to a circular letter of the chairman of the committee, the postmaster of that place transmitted to him a letter, a part of which I will quote:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER,
Oak Park, Cook County, Ill.

* * * Some of our reasons for thinking a public building should be erected in Oak Park are:

First, that the amount of postal business done here warrants the erection of a building. We have 14 letter carriers, 6 clerks (including assistant postmaster), and I have the recommendation of the assistant superintendent of free-delivery division that 2 additional carriers be allowed us when the appropriation for 1902 be available.

Second, that our present quarters are totally inadequate. Including substitute letter carriers, special messenger boys, and janitor, there are 25 persons employed in the office, with a space within the walls of only 1,749 feet. There is no swing room for the carriers, no lockers for the clerks or carriers, a lack of rack room, and inadequate toilet facilities for the female clerks; and the office occupies the same room it did when less than half the present force was employed.

Third, that the character of the public and private buildings in Oak Park, with its reputation of being one of the most beautiful places in the West, calls for a post-office building that will not discredit the National Government.

Fourth, that it will be more economical to spend \$35,000 for a building (at the rate of interest paid by the Government) than it will be to pay rent for such quarters as will have to be provided us.

Respectfully submitted.

W. A. HUTCHINSON, Postmaster.

I could add little to that, even if I had the time. The post-office at Oak Park serves three distinct villages—Oak Park, Harlem, and River Forest—the population of which in 1900 was, Oak Park, 9,653; Harlem, 4,112; River Forest, 1,664—a total of 15,439.

Mr. Chairman, we do not ask an appropriation for any building which, if erected, might be regarded as a magnificent monument. We do not ask that the United States Government shall squander any vast sum of money there. The simple, modest sum of \$35,000 to erect a post-office which would be in keeping with the growth and business of that city is all we ask.

I have nothing but words of praise for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and its chairman. A day was accorded by the committee for hearing a delegation of the leading citizens of that place. They came on here with the support of two United States Senators from our State and several Representatives, all but one of the Representatives of our State being in accord with this proposition. We appeared before the committee and made our representations. Every courtesy was extended to us by the committee. Since then I have visited the committee very many times and received the assurance that the matter was receiving due consideration. I suppose that in the judgment of the committee the proposition did receive due consideration. I conceive

the proposition of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MERCER] to be reasonable when he says that it is impossible for his committee to give favorable consideration to all the bills that are brought in here.

But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the appropriation which we ask for Oak Park is less than one three-hundred-and-ninetieth part of the total appropriation carried by this bill. There will be 390 Representatives in the next House. I submit that no one on the committee, no one anywhere with a show of reason, has ever presumed to oppose this appropriation publicly on its merits. The two United States Senators from our State favor it. The delegation of the State in this House, with one exception, favors it. The people of that district are unitedly in favor of it. Of the \$35,000 asked, \$10,000 is for the site and \$25,000 for the building.

In justice to my predecessor in this House, who was by some thought to be opposed to this proposition, I wish to say that I have every assurance from him and his friends that he favored the proposition; that he saw no politics in it, and could not conceive how anyone could construe political benefit to come to anyone from such a plain business proposition as this.

But, Mr. Chairman, it seems that some people lie awake at night computing the political effect that combing their hair in the morning will have on the United States. Some people are so small, so picayunish, so devoted to a system of rat-hole politics that whenever a measure is introduced into Congress any Representative who takes an interest in its passage is at once a subject of their criticism, and at once they undertake to defeat him if by any means any credit—did I say credit?—sometimes discredit—can come to them by reason of that fact.

Mr. Chairman, this is my first term in this House. It may be, and likely will be, the last—for some time at least. I have endeavored while here to demean myself in a gentlemanly and measurably modest manner toward all the members of this House. I have received the fullest consideration, notwithstanding all the complaints about the rules, from nearly all the members of the House. But there has come to my hands evidence that there was in connection with this bill a secret and malign influence—not operating against me, because I have no political interest at stake. Operating against whom? The people of Oak Park, the people of Harlem, and the people of River Forest, communities aggregating 15,000 souls—a community of as fine a people as live anywhere in this country. They are pioneers worthy of every appreciation. What was a few years ago a bleak rural country they have transformed by their work and by their taste and their patience into what I consider one of the most beautiful residential localities in the world. It would have been a matter of great pride to me if I could have secured for them the consideration to which they are entitled.

I have to submit here a letter written by a member of this House, representing a constituency 20 miles distant from the boundaries of this post-office district, representing a constituency which has nothing in common, a district which is not territorially contiguous, and I will read this letter without comment. I will submit it to the fair judgment of every member of this House. I will leave its impression to lie where it ought to lie. The letter is as follows:

Mr. H. W. AUSTIN,
Oak Park State Bank, Oak Park, Ill.

DEAR SIR: My friend, Mr. Williams, subtreasurer, has indorsed your favor of recent date to me, and also written to me urging my aid in securing a Government building at Oak Park. In my judgment the only chance Oak Park had to secure a public building was through the reelection of Mr. Lorimer to Congress. If I remember correctly, the Oak Park people were not very enthusiastic in his support. Oak Park is in the district represented by Mr. FEELY, as far as the present Congress is concerned, and will probably have to wait so long as it is represented by a new member of Congress.

Yours, very sincerely,

J. R. MANN.

I submit, gentlemen, that while a man may be a new member of Congress, while he may endeavor to do all that is possible for his district with the cooperation of the United States Senators and the unanimous support of his State delegation, with one exception, yet it may be possible that such influences as I have referred to can defeat favorable consideration of measures he would introduce. I say again, Mr. Chairman, I have no criticism to make of the committee except as to their judgment. If there was sufficient conflict between those interested—in favor of and opposed to this measure—then the committee doubtless believe that they were justified in relegating the matter to the pigeon-hole where it may remain until the event referred to in the letter I have read may happen, at which time Oak Park may get the post-office which it desires.

Mr. MERCER. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit a suggestion at this point? I desire to say that the gentleman from Illinois was most attentive in his duties with reference to this matter and gave the committee all the information which he could secure, and the committee was very sorry that it could not

include Oak Park in this bill, and if it had not been for the complications which would have followed, and not political by any means, but business complications which would have compelled us to take up some other places in Illinois, we would have included Oak Park. If it had been the only one of the kind, Oak Park would have been included.

I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to occupy the attention of the committee or to make any extended remarks. I wish to put in the RECORD a statement of facts which justifies the committee in one paragraph of the bill, that which relates to a public building at McKeesport, Pa. I ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to insert the statement to which he refers in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The statement referred to by Mr. DALZELL is as follows:

McKeesport is a city of the third class, in Pennsylvania, with a population now estimated at 40,000, with rapidly growing suburbs—Glassport, East McKeesport, Versailles, and Dravosburg—increasing the total to about 50,000 people. It is situated on the Monongahela River, 15 miles above Pittsburgh, and, in addition to the Baltimore and Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Erie railroads, has three electric railway systems, which give regular and rapid communication with all surrounding districts. By these lines carriers leaving the McKeesport office could within twenty minutes deliver mail at the following points, now independent offices, namely, Duquesne, Dravosburg, Otto, Glassport, East McKeesport, Boston, Buenavista, and Lincoln, all within 3 miles; and a 5-mile radius would include the towns of Turtlecreek, East Pittsburgh, Wilmerding, and Pitsa, in the Turtle Creek valley, and the towns of Coal Valley, Mendelssohn, Wilson, Hawkins, and Clairton, on the north side of the Monongahela. The first named are now reached by well-paved streets, with electric-car service, which within a year will also be extended to the river towns. These towns, like McKeesport, are all rapidly growing manufacturing centers, with a population of 30,000 people; so that McKeesport and the district contiguous to it, as a center for the rapid distribution of mail, now has a population of not less than 80,000, which must increase to 100,000 within three years. These 17 towns now receive from 4 to 6 mails per day, but were they connected with McKeesport would have from 10 to 30 mails per day, and all Eastern mails would be from two to five hours earlier, and one or more hours would be gained on the Western.

The growth of the Monongahela Valley has been phenomenal for the past five years and is more rapid to-day than at any previous period. It is one community from Pittsburgh to McKeesport, and in ten years the district from McKeesport to Monongahela—a distance of 18 miles—will also be a continuous town, connected by bridges from the bluffs at each bend in the river to the opposite plateaus, with paved streets and electric-car service from one end of the valley to the other. The most sanguine estimate of the population would likely fall short of the reality; yet it is reasonably safe to say that, including the towns mentioned in the Turtle Creek Valley and those in the Monongahela Valley—all within a 5-mile radius—with McKeesport as one post-office district, the next census would certainly show a combined population of 150,000 people, who would thus receive much better service at greatly reduced cost. To properly serve this district now from McKeesport would require facilities four times as great as we have at present, and the necessity for a modern building would at once be admitted.

Yet, aside from the advantages to the Department from such a service, the actual situation at the McKeesport office demands a radical change, even when only the district now covered by the carriers is considered. The present building has been occupied for sixteen years, and the service has outgrown it. The rent has been \$1,200, but changes and improvements must be made, and the rent has been raised to \$1,800 including some minor changes, or \$2,300 and make improvements as suggested by the Department. The room would then answer for a few years only, and we would soon outgrow it again. The Department advertised for a suitable room, but no offers were received. Rents are very high on Fifth avenue, the main business street, and sufficient space there would cost from \$4,000 to \$5,000 per annum. There are no buildings on the side streets sufficiently large to accommodate the office, and owners will not build for the purpose without the protection of a long lease at a high rental. The present service requires 8 clerks and 20 carriers, with receipts now over \$3,000 per month. Thirty-five mails are received and 31 dispatched daily, and about 2,200 money orders and registered letters are entered monthly. Owing to the fact that most of our manufacturing firms have Pittsburgh offices and get their special-request envelopes in that city, and that the main offices of our electric-light and gas companies are in Pittsburgh and collections are made by postal cards purchased there, the receipts of our office are from \$3,000 to \$4,000 per annum less than they should be, considering the work done in collecting and delivering these letters and postals.

That the importance of McKeesport has not been overstated is shown by the census of 1900, from which it appears that in the annual output of her industries McKeesport stands fourth in the list of cities of the State, with a total annual product of \$37,074,136, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Allegheny only outranking her. Should we include with McKeesport only those towns which would be included within a 2-mile radius, as shown by the map, our city would be third and stand next to Pittsburgh as a manufacturing center. All that is needed is consolidation and the establishment of a central government for communities which are now one in hourly intercourse and all essential interests, and our rank as third city of the State would not be disputed, and statistics would not be required to show our need for a Federal building. Fortunately for our present purpose, municipal jealousies and corporate lines need not be considered, and the only matters of prime importance are the needs of the public and the economy of the service. We are a manufacturing people, hemmed into a narrow valley by high hills, and a denser population can hardly be found in any of our large cities, and our neighbors are in no respect more favorably situated. A public building will not only serve us better, but will more than double the facilities for their service, giving them free delivery and frequent mails—two essentials for which the Department is constantly striving. That there would be economy in a service such as has been suggested need hardly be stated with a population so dense as ours and so well supplied with paved streets and street-car service with 5-cent fare for 5 miles. To virtually stand still and continue methods a quarter century old in a district adding from five to ten thousand to its population annually is certain to result in inefficiency, as well as great expense and loss to the service.

As evidence of the extent and diversity of the industries of the McKeesport district, the following list, embracing the iron and steel furnaces and

other manufactories in operation within a 2-mile radius of the center of the city, is presented: National Tube and Pipe Mills, National Rolling Mill, Monongahela Furnaces, Monongahela Steel Works, Boston Iron and Steel Works, Seamless Tube Works, National Galvanizing Works, W. De Wees Wood Company's Works, United States Iron and Tinplate Works, Fifth-Sterling Steel Works, Wheeler Projectile Works, Duquesne Steel Works, Duquesne Blast Furnaces, McKeesport Tinplate Works, Pittsburgh Gas and Coke Works, United States Glass Works, Pittsburgh Steel Hoop Works, Severance Spike and Bolt Works, Pittsburgh Steel Foundry, American Ax and Tool Works, Pittsburgh and Lake Erie Railroad Shops.

The total value of these combined plants is estimated to be \$60,000,000, with a monthly product valued at \$10,000,000; the total number of men employed being 15,000, and from 1,000 to 2,000 men employed in other minor industries.

A reliable computation of the monthly pay roll of the works enumerated as being within 2 miles of the center of the city is \$750,000, or an annual pay roll of the enormous sum of \$9,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE].

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, it must have surprised the members of this House to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds remark that those who had spoken in favor of a new post-office in the city of New York had, by their insistence to secure action on the bill, done more than anyone else in retarding the committee in reporting the bill.

Just what the chairman of the committee meant by that I am at a loss to understand. If he meant that by firm advocacy of the bill for an appropriation for a new post-office, by repeated requests on the committee to act on the bill, by repeated calls of members of the New York delegation on the gentleman from Nebraska to secure his action, by earnest effort, from time to time, by that delegation in their endeavor to secure a favorable report upon the bill which the committee had in charge for the erection of a new post-office was to retard the measure, then, of course, the measure was so retarded.

The delegation from New York had met in conference. That conference was presided over by the dean of our delegation on this side of the House, our able friend, Mr. CUMMINGS. We discussed the question as to what action should be taken, what further efforts should be employed, and what other means should be resorted to to secure from the committee a report upon the bill. During that conference it was stated by members of the delegation that the gentleman from Nebraska had been called upon repeatedly and urged to make a report to the House on the bill for a new post-office.

Members of the delegation stated that the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska had been called to the conditions that exist in New York City, rendering it imperatively necessary that we should have improved postal facilities and adequate quarters for the transaction of our postal business in that great and growing city commensurate with the post-office needs. We united our efforts—gentlemen on this side of the Chamber and those on the other side of the Chamber—to secure action by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

In a body we called at the room of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and there we waited to see its chairman. We sent for him. We waited, and waited his will. After a while the gentleman came and deigned to see us. He did not even do us the scant courtesy of asking us to be seated. Coldly and austere he received our delegation and wanted to know what we wanted. Our spokesman, Mr. CUMMINGS, stated the views of the delegation. He told the gentleman from Nebraska what was urgently needed and most desired. He called the gentleman's attention to the need of a new post-office, but the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds did not venture any more response than that he would consult the members of his committee about it.

That interview took place some time after the gentleman from Nebraska had himself declared that the need of New York was aggravated and had expressed himself strongly in favor of a new post-office for New York City. The interview with the gentleman from Nebraska to which I refer took place after publications had appeared in some of the leading papers published in the metropolis calling his attention and the attention of the committee, as well as of Congress, to the needs for the desired improvement.

The gentleman from Nebraska said to-day that his attention had not been called to the needs of our city. Surely it can not be that the gentleman from the Far West is oblivious to the conditions obtaining in our great metropolis. It can not be that the chairman of so great and important a committee as he heads does not understand that one-tenth of the gross receipts of the entire postal service is obtained from New York. He can not be oblivious to the fact that an appropriation of \$2,500,000, which was asked, is but about 35 per cent of the net annual revenue from the postal service in the city of New York alone. When he made the onslaught on the entire New York delegation this morning on the floor of this House, he was oblivious to the fact that New York City—

Mr. MERCER. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion there?

I never made any onslaught on the entire delegation from the city of New York or the State of New York. My reference was made to the gentleman who is now occupying the floor and two of his colleagues who have spoken in reference to this measure. I referred to no other gentleman from the city of New York.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What did the gentleman who is now addressing the committee do to offend the chairman of the committee? He called respectfully upon the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, with other members of the delegation, and in a perfectly polite manner asked for favorable action upon a bill the committee had in charge. Upon the floor of this House he arose and called the attention of the members to the conditions that make it necessary to erect a new post-office in New York City adequate for our needs. He submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds statistics which appeared in print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He joined his colleagues in a respectful request for favorable consideration. What can the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds then mean? I pause to give the gentleman an opportunity of saying whether I did anything else, or whether my colleagues did anything else, in respect to the matter which was not agreeable to the committee.

Mr. MERCER. Do you want a reply? The gentleman from New York, and the other two gentlemen to whom I referred at the beginning of the session to-day, have never given the committee, so far as I know, a line of information. They made some speeches on the floor of this House. They did not even send us copies of their speeches.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Did you receive any information from any other member of the delegation?

Mr. MERCER. We received information from the able and distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS], one of the noblest Romans of them all, who I sincerely hope will soon recover from the illness from which he is now suffering. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Did he not furnish you full and complete information?

Mr. MERCER. He furnished the committee with some splendid information, and he never attempted to impede the progress of the committee with reference to this great project in New York.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I am glad that the gentleman from Nebraska has made that statement. If so able and efficient a member of this House as Mr. CUMMINGS has supplied the gentleman with full information, why did he not act upon it? Was it necessary for each member of our delegation to come to him and, like a mendicant on bended knee, beg the favor of audiences of the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds?

Mr. MERCER. If the gentleman from New York will permit, I think the committee are very familiar with the situation in New York, and have been for some time.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Did you not say this morning that you were not familiar with the situation?

Mr. MERCER. Most of the members of the committee have been in New York; they have visited the post-office there and know a great deal about it, and the committee has taken the very same course that was pursued with reference to the great Congressional Library and the great Printing Office in this city.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman point out specifically in what way any member of this delegation retarded action on the bill?

Mr. MERCER. The gentleman from New York who is now addressing the House, by making certain statements on the floor, by going out of his way to publish editorials from newspapers which had no foundation in fact, and which in a measure ridiculed the members of the New York delegation.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Does the gentleman mean to say that the editorial published in the New York Herald on February 28, read in my speech, is untrue?

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska points to nothing beyond the making of a speech on the floor of this House which in any degree is claimed to have retarded action. Surely it can not be that in the performance of a duty assigned to a committee, a duty that ought to be faithfully and conscientiously discharged in the interest of the nation, the gentleman's wounded sensibilities, caused by the Herald's editorial, stopped him from doing what was right and just to the country at large?

I am surprised that the reading of a newspaper editorial from the Clerk's desk, calling the gentleman to account, is assigned by him for the committee's failure to report the bill for a new post-office. The post-office in New York is not a local, but a national institution.

Mr. MERCER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question right there?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes.

Mr. MERCER. Does the gentleman from New York intend to vote against this bill?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I intend, if I can not get anything better, to vote for the bill. But I had hoped that we would have obtained something better. I trusted that the opportunity to offer an amendment would not have been cut off and that we could have secured, by way of amendment, a provision in the pending bill which would have speedily given to New York the post-office so much needed. No opportunity is afforded to anyone from New York to offer an amendment which will cure the defect in the bill.

The bill provides that a site shall be selected, but those who are to select the site are officials in Washington. There is no provision made in the bill for the erection of the building. On the contrary, the bill clearly contemplates there shall be further delay. Another Congress shall have to pass upon the question, and we shall have to go through the same logrolling which has characterized the action of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with respect to the measure originally introduced. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to my colleague from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the support which I give this bill is not actuated or influenced in any manner by either local or personal considerations. It is true I was an earnest and I might be considered an active applicant before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for the erection of a public building—a post-office—in one of the most flourishing and prosperous cities in the beautiful valley of the Tennessee—Florence, in the northern section of Alabama; but the committee saw proper in its judgment and wisdom to deny me that application; and the comfort that I take, Mr. Chairman, as to my disappointment is in the accepted theory that “faith is the substance of things hoped for,” and “to him that hath faith all things will be added, provided he abideth his time and patience;” and I find that I am sustained, Mr. Chairman, in that theory and belief in this paragraph which the committee, in its report, so appropriately uses. It says:

It is impossible to meet all the demands of the country at this session of Congress, but let us hope that this effort of the committee will be followed by a general desire on the part of Congress and the country that those cities where buildings are inadequate, or where new buildings are needed and which have not been recognized in this bill, may reap their reward at an early date.

Now, I am truly in that class—expecting to reap my reward at an early day. I am, Mr. Chairman, of that class of citizens who believe that it is a wise and patriotic policy for the Government to adopt, to erect substantial public buildings in all cities and towns where the public good and character of the business interests of the people demand it. I do not want to be understood as favoring a policy that would justify and excuse unlimited expenditures of public money at every village and every town throughout our whole country. That would be untenable and utterly unreasonable. But I am an advocate—and an earnest and a sincere one from a patriotic standpoint—of the inauguration of a policy that looks in the early future to the erection of a public building commensurate with the population and the business interests, and I refer now mostly to post-offices in every county seat of every county and State and Territory in this Union.

I say it will appeal to the pride and patriotism of the people, and it has another effect. It shows the people that they have a part and a parcel in their Government; that the Government is not a something that is intangible, but it is something that they can touch, reach, feel, and understand—not a mere creature to make laws and provide penalties. I believe it is the duty of the Government to localize the influence of the Government as far as can be done practically with common sense and good judgment. What better way to do this can be devised than a reasonable policy of erecting public buildings? Why, Mr. Speaker, we have all seen the effect of it. After locating a public building in a county seat, the people of that town and of that county point to it with pride. They say, “It is our public building.” They use the word “our.” They have an interest in it. They feel that the Government has done something especially for them and their neighbors, for their use and for their benefit. It gives the Government a name, an abiding place among them.

And I say, too, Mr. Chairman, that it is an economical matter. It is a matter that appeals, as to dollars and cents, to us not to be “penny wise and pound foolish”—a policy that we have pursued for many years in the past—but adopt a sound business policy. You can not take any business man or any firm of business men that have at their command anything to compare with the resources that the Government has that would pursue the policy that the Government has pursued for years past in renting private property for the transaction of public business.

Another idea, Mr. Chairman, is that it is the accepted theory, if I understand it aright, that the chief and first end, object, and purpose of the Government in all matters should be to enlist the love and affection, the aid and cooperation, and the loyalty of the

people. How best can this be done? What manner and in what way can we better accomplish these desirable ends than by placing among them public buildings—giving them object lessons, for that is what a public building is?

Why, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the spirit that inspired the homestead law, noble and patriotic as it was, and as it is in every respect, is nearly akin, is similar, and on “all fours” with the policy that I believe this bill reported by the committee is leading to. Why, the aim and end of this beneficent law was to create a happy, contented, frugal, prosperous, God-fearing people, by conferring upon them the unutterable blessings of a home. I say to-day, Mr. Chairman, that around the sacred altar of the humble home of the masses of the people of this country are born the grand and noble aspirations that give purity and strength and nobility to our republican form of Government. [Applause.]

Around the altar of these common homes that have been made by the homestead law we find the true nursery of American patriotism and of freedom—yea, of magnificent womanhood and manhood.

There is another feature, as I pass along, that attracts me to this bill. Why, there is no contest, political, religious, social, or otherwise, that can possibly bring up among the people the bitter and discordant feelings that accompanies the contest for the removal of a county court-house. It divides brother against brother, it arrays father against son, and creates the bitterest feeling. It leaves scars that time can scarcely heal. If you had a public Government building located there it would tend to quiet all of these dissensions and strife and make harmony and peace among these people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe, as history has said, that a people are judged as to their refinement, their patriotism, their sociability, and civilization, and all that ennobles manhood, by the monuments they leave behind them; they are judged by these monuments that they erect to their heroes, their soldiers, their scholars, and their statesmen. I am proud to know that no section of our country has been derelict in splendid monuments to our noble men.

It can be as truly said that the public buildings of our country—magnificent structures—are as characteristic of a people as the monuments they have of their heroes. They speak to future generations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I wish to speak of in the State of Alabama that has met with rejoicing and more universal approbation than any one single act of that character that has been called to our attention within the last ten years. The general assembly of Alabama within the last two years passed a law directing and requiring that the United States flag shall float over every public school-house in the State. [Applause.] It is the emblem of our Government; it brings the people in closer touch—nearer to the Government. So it would be with a public building.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I see that the Committee on Public Buildings provides for the erection of a splendid and much-needed public building in the city of Washington. What citizen is there that can come from any section of our country and look upon these magnificent structures that has not his patriotism aroused and appealed to? We all want to see the capital of this, the greatest Republic in the world, noted for its magnificent structures—not a useless expenditure of money, but money expended wisely and prudently and discreetly. All of this will strengthen the feelings of patriotism among the people. I would be one, Mr. Chairman, and I believe the country could afford the expense to have so many of the good, plain people of this country visit the capital once every year and have their expenses and hotel bills paid to let them understand and see what their Government is. It would be a matter of pride to them and strengthen them in their patriotism and love of their country. Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge my thanks to my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] for his courtesy in extending my time. [Applause.]

Mr. MERCER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY].

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, whether the policy of the Government in the construction of public buildings in the communities of the Union is wise or not seems to be questioned by some who are not so fortunate on this occasion to find the home towns in their communities represented in this measure. The Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads in the consideration of their appropriation bill of this year found it requisite to appropriate \$8,000,000 for the rental of buildings for postal purposes. At the present interest rates and price of Government bonds these rentals would provide for a public building at the cost of \$100,000 each

in every city of the United States containing 10,000 people and upward which is not already so provided and still leave several hundred thousand dollars each year in the Government Treasury. My judgment is that this measure is to be criticised, not because it provides for so many public buildings, but because it does not provide for more. That the Government should erect public buildings in the cities of the nation is a policy demanded not alone by the needs of the service, but by reasons of economy as well.

Mr. MERCER. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

[Mr. GAINES of Tennessee addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the town of Springfield, Tenn., in reply to the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from the district in which that town is located, I desire to say that it was utterly impossible for the committee to take cognizance of claims of this character. Springfield in 1900 had a population of 1,732, and its gross postal receipts were \$3,138.49.

I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TOMPKINS]. Mr. TOMPKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as under the rules the pending bill is not subject to amendment, it is not my desire to occupy the attention of the committee on this subject for any length of time. I simply wish to join in the general expression of disappointment which doubtless prevails among many of the 400 who presented their claims for the consideration of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and get nothing substantial. I felt that the claims of the city of Columbus for the enlargement and alteration of the public building already erected and now in use there were sufficiently strong to persuade the committee favorably to include in its omnibus bill an appropriation for the purpose indicated.

It was my privilege to appear before a subcommittee of that body, accompanied by a number of gentlemen sent here from the Board of Trade of Columbus, and statements were made to that subcommittee, which accorded us every privilege and every courtesy that could be expected or asked. The committee has not seen fit to include any appropriation for Columbus, but we drew a consolation prize in the recommendation made in this bill to the effect that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster-General take steps to investigate the conditions at Columbus to ascertain the necessities there and report to Congress at its next session. I also draw consolation from the suggestion of my good friend from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] that we should live in hope by reason of the recommendations made in this bill where no appropriations have been provided.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement made to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in presenting the claims of the city of Columbus may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks on this occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TOMPKINS] asks unanimous consent that the statement heretofore presented to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds may be printed as a part of his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The document referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 1, 1902.

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: On behalf of the Board of Trade of Columbus, Ohio, we beg leave to submit the following facts concerning the need for an enlargement of the Government building in said city. These facts are carefully compiled from the official records of the several departments of the Government, and show in a striking manner the inadequacy of present accommodations for the Government service in Columbus:

A. GENERAL FACTS.

The present public building was first occupied in 1885. By the census of 1880 the city had 51,647 population. The census of 1900 gives it a population of 125,500. This is in an area of only 16.25 square miles. If the city bounds were proportionate with those of cities like Toledo, Cleveland, or Buffalo, there would be included in the city limits to-day not less than 140,000 people. Taking the population actually shown by the 1900 census within the city limits, there has been a growth of 125 per cent since the present building was constructed.

No city in the United States is growing more rapidly to-day than Columbus. In the calendar year 1900 the official records of the city inspector of buildings show that 1,800 new buildings were erected, a larger number than were constructed in the same period in the city of Buffalo, N. Y.; twice as many as were built in Omaha, Nebr., and 75 per cent of the number constructed in Pittsburgh.

Within the past few years the city has come into great prominence as a growing center of iron and steel making, and the records of the United States Steel Corporation show that at no point in the Central West can iron or steel be made more cheaply. This industry promises great development within the next decade. Already Columbus stands fifth among the cities of the United States in the number of shoes manufactured annually, and this business is growing at the rate of 25 per cent per annum. Other factories which have grown to large proportions in the past are now building new works, doubling, and in some cases trebling, their present capacity.

The shops of the Pan Handle Railroad Company are being enlarged, at an

expenditure of more than half a million dollars, with a proportionate increase in their already large force of employees, which numbers 1,500 or more.

A dispassionate review of the progress of the city during the past two years will convince any student of affairs that the rate of increase in population during the next decade will be larger than it has been in the past. It is conservative to say that by 1910 there will be 200,000 people immediately tributary to the Federal building of the city of Columbus, and it must be adequate to meet the need of that great population, fourfold that of the city when the present structure was planned.

Moreover, as the capital of the fourth State of the Union, the Government building ought to be one that would be commensurate with the dignity and power of the State. Both from this standpoint and from that of the third greatest manufacturing city in Ohio the necessity of the enlargement asked is manifest.

B. GROWTH OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.

When the present Federal building was planned, the establishment at Columbus of a department of the Pension Bureau was not contemplated. This is now one of the largest branches of this great Bureau in the United States, having on its rolls 105,000 pensioners and distributing annually more than \$16,000,000. Already this bureau is greatly cramped for room, and if the plan now suggested, of making monthly instead of quarterly payments to pensioners, is carried out, the number of employees and the space necessary must be doubled. This department now occupies about 25 per cent of the total floor space of the present building, or an aggregate of over 3,700 square feet. Every room is crowded and the space for the necessary file cases, etc., is wretchedly inadequate. The present work of the bureau imperatively demands an increase of not less than 1,200 square feet, while the probability of the payment of pensioners monthly would require an increase of fully 4,000 square feet to give this bureau the space its importance demands.

When the present Government building at Columbus was constructed the city was not a port of entry. It was so constituted in 1889. Last year approximately \$500,000 worth of goods were imported at this point. This great volume of business was transacted without any facilities for keeping goods in bond, other than a little corner of the basement, about 10 by 15 feet. The great risk in having goods in bond scattered at random in railway depots, storage warehouses, and held in cars on side-tracks only needs to be mentioned to emphasize the inadequacy of the present building for public purposes.

The central location of the city of Columbus, from which radiate in every direction fifteen lines of steam railway and nine interurban electric lines, constructed or under construction, makes it an especially important point in the Railway Mail Service. At the present time this important branch of the service has no quarters in the public building, but has been compelled to seek them outside at a relatively high rental, and it has been impossible to secure the dormitories necessary for the proper housing of the men in this service to promote their health and comfort.

During the past ten years this force in Columbus has increased 50 per cent, and 138 men are now tributary to this office. More postal clerks report to Columbus and work from this city than from Louisville, Ky., or Detroit, Mich., both much more populous centers. The absence to-day of any room for the proper keeping of the supplies which this Department requires; the absence of any general office, where maps can be consulted and general instructions given, and the unhandy, badly arranged quarters which are inevitable in the case of rented rooms make it imperative that some provision be made at once for the proper housing of this important branch of the public service in Columbus by an enlargement of the Government building.

The post-office business in the city of Columbus has vastly increased since the present building was planned. In 1887 the total post-office receipts of the city were \$130,000. For the calendar year 1901 they reached the great total of \$405,000, an increase in 15 years of more than 300 per cent. The sales of stamps for January, 1902, were more than \$12,000 in excess of the same month of 1901. A conservative estimate of the growth of the post-office business in Columbus indicates that by 1910 the receipts of this office will approximate, if not exceed, \$700,000. When the present building was first occupied but 29 employees were required to handle the work of the office, this number including carriers. To-day, with the most economical and efficient business management of any post-office in the United States, handling its large volume of business at less cost to the Government than can be shown by any other office of a city of like size in the United States, 120 men are employed.

Between 1889 and 1899 the number of pieces of mail handled at the Columbus office increased from 14,000,000 to 38,000,000, or almost threefold. The Government's net revenue for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, from the Columbus post-office amounted to \$262,079.53, almost enough in itself to meet the entire expense of the improvement asked for. The absolute needs of this office to-day demand at least twice the floor space which the Government building now affords it. Every department is crowded to the utmost. The stamp clerks have a room only 8 by 11 feet; the register department, including lobby and vault, only 16 by 18 feet. No adequate quarters for the prompt handling of the mail exist at the present time, and the public suffers constant inconvenience and delay, notwithstanding the most conscientious effort upon the part of the officials to prevent it.

The Federal courts now occupy 5,350 square feet, approximately 30 per cent of the total floor area of the building. A movement is on foot, made necessary by the increased business of the Federal courts in Ohio, to create a district judge located permanently at Columbus. It is certain that this will be necessary in the immediate future and will require at least 75 per cent more floor space than is now occupied by the Federal courts.

The United States Weather Bureau is now housed outside of the Federal building at a large expense. It requires at least 2,000 square feet of floor space. With the proper enlargement the location of the Government building fits it to accommodate this important branch of the public service at a large saving to the Government.

The internal-revenue department has grown quite as rapidly as the post-office. The receipts for the fiscal year 1890 did not reach \$300,000. For the year 1899 they exceeded \$1,120,000, an increase of more than 300 per cent. This department is crowded, as is every department in the public building, and should have at least 1,000 square feet more space.

At a conservative figure, the present needs of the public service in the city of Columbus require a building with twice the floor space of the present structure, and the future development of the city makes it certain that even this enlargement will not be adequate to meet the requirements ten years hence. The recent location of an immigration inspector and the great development of the rural free-delivery service, in connection with the other departments mentioned, emphasize most strongly the imperative need for the immediate construction of a building with a floor space of not less than 25,000 square feet additional to the present area of about 17,800 feet.

The Federal Government already owns sufficient ground upon which to erect the additional building, without expenditure for site. The lot occupied by the Federal building is 159 by 189 feet, of which the present structure occupies a space 75 by 130, standing back 15 feet from each street. This leaves a space 90 by 189 feet, fronting on Third street and immediately south of the present building, which is sufficient for the erection of a structure that will meet the needs and be worthy of the city and the State for a decade or more to come.

To recapitulate in few words: Since the present Government building was constructed the population of Columbus has increased more than 125 per cent. The pension bureau and the surveyor of the port have been established, requiring between them approximately 30 per cent of the total floor area of the present structure, neither of which were contemplated when the existing building was planned. The cash receipts of the post-office department have grown over 400 per cent in fifteen years; the amount of mail handled has increased in the past ten years almost 300 per cent; the internal-revenue receipts in the last ten years have increased nearly 300 per cent, and the net revenue of the combined Government departments in the city of Columbus has reached a figure that will pay for the enlargement asked in less than five months.

This, gentlemen, is a concise, dispassionate statement of plain facts. No argument is necessary to enforce it or to make clear the reasonable request which we now make. The proper and safe conduct of the public business in Columbus demands the improvement provided by this bill, and the volume of business and the importance of the city as a great center of industry and population justifies the expenditure.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN T. RASSELL,
SAMUEL G. MCCLURE,
ELMER J. MILLER,

Committee of the Columbus Board of Trade.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the proposition affecting the city of Columbus, Ohio, I desire to say that the distinguished gentleman [Mr. TOMPKINS] who has the honor of representing the district in which that capital city is located has given this matter his best attention, has answered all the calls made upon him by the committee for information, and has made the best presentation of the case that could be made; but the situation in Columbus is of such a character that the committee felt that the information before it did not justify it in taking any action unless the information should prove to be exactly correct. For that reason the committee decided that rather than make a mistake in the city of Columbus it would provide for an investigation of the situation there and for a responsible report, and that when such a report was made to Congress by those appointed to investigate the committee would then be in a better position to legislate thereon.

I find that in December, 1882, a site was purchased in Columbus, Ohio, 189 feet square, at a cost of \$58,500. It was bounded on the north by State street, on the west by Third street, on the south by Chapel alley, on the east by Lazelle alley. A contract was awarded for the foundation on November 14, 1883. The first story was occupied by the post-office October 1, 1887, and the other stories were completed a few weeks thereafter, the cost of construction being \$264,588.96, the total cost of site and building to date being \$334,345.50. The building is of Berea, Ohio, sandstone, and covers an area of 184 by 75 feet, and has cubic contents of 793,954 feet, a very fair building in size for a city of the size of Columbus. The data we had might lead us to conclude that more space is needed in that city, but we did not have sufficient information to justify us taking any action at this time aside from the recommendation we have made in the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LANDIS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. CROOK, one of his secretaries.

OMNIBUS PUBLIC-BUILDING BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield ten minutes, or so much as he may need, to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire just for a moment to refer to that part of the bill on page 8 which reads as follows:

United States post-office and court-house at Elizabeth City, N. C., from \$100,000 to \$120,000: *Provided*, That said building shall be erected upon the site in said city now owned by the Government of the United States.

Under the rule adopted, and under which the House, as in Committee of the Whole, is considering this bill, no amendments are in order or can be made to the bill. Therefore my remarks shall be confined to matters in explanation of my own position and the action of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of this House.

So far as the increased limit of cost from \$100,000 to \$120,000 is concerned, I make no comment or criticism, because I feel very sure that the committee have given the claims of this city thorough consideration; and although the increase is not as much as we desired or as much as was recommended by the Treasury Department, still I feel that the committee gave that city the best consideration, under the circumstances, which they thought it deserved. But I do desire to make a word of explanation in regard to the provision which is to the effect that the building shall be located upon the site already owned by the Government. On the 3d day of February I introduced a bill to increase the limit of cost of that public building from \$100,000 to \$125,000. In the Fifty-fifth Congress (March, 1899) this public building was originally authorized and the limit of cost fixed at \$50,000.

At the last session I introduced a bill by which the limit of cost

was increased from \$50,000 to \$100,000. During this session, on the 3d day of February, I introduced a bill to further increase the limit of cost from \$100,000 to \$125,000. After I had introduced this bill, increasing the limit of cost to \$125,000, a committee from the Chamber of Commerce of Elizabeth City appeared before the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. H. A. Taylor, and the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, Hon. J. K. Taylor, representing that the site owned by the Government was not a proper site, and that it was advisable to purchase another site. As a result of these representations the Treasury Department agreed that it would recommend to Congress legislation authorizing the purchase of another site. To that end I introduced on the 28th day of February a bill authorizing the Treasury Department to acquire another site for this court-house and post-office and custom-house building at Elizabeth City, and on the same day I introduced a bill increasing the limit of cost to \$135,000, which bills I shall append as a part of my remarks.

These bills were referred by the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to the Treasury Department, and I shall ask to have incorporated as a part of my remarks the replies of the Treasury Department both to the bill increasing the limit of cost to \$125,000 and to the two bills increasing the cost to \$135,000 and authorizing the Treasury Department to purchase or condemn a new site. I will simply say that the Treasury Department recommended the passage of the two bills, one of which authorized the purchase of a new site, but suggested that the bill be amended, leaving it discretionary with the Treasury Department as to whether or not they would acquire another site in the future. This was the situation when the several bills came for consideration before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

At this point I ask the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds [Mr. MERCER] to the statement which I shall make. I had stated to the committee representing the Chamber of Commerce of Elizabeth City, and also to the distinguished chairman and the gentlemen of the committee, that I should take no part in the selection of a new site or in the recommendation of a new site, but that so far as I was concerned it should be left entirely to the citizens of Elizabeth City on the one part and the Treasury Department and to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on the other to determine that question. I was not present when the committee acted nor had any notice of same until they had concluded their action. In that connection the distinguished chairman stated to me that the committee had considered this matter and had determined to include a proviso in the bill increasing the limit of cost, providing that the building should be constructed on the site now owned by the Government. I ask the chairman if that statement is not correct?

Mr. MERCER. I desire to say to the gentleman, in reply to his inquiry, that a site has been purchased in Elizabeth City at an expense of \$4,000. We found upon investigation that it would be impossible to dispose of that site for much more than half that sum; and the committee, after investigation, reported that the present site was of ample size and suitably located for a building such as was to be erected there, and took the sole responsibility in making the provision in the bill that the building should be erected on the site now owned by the Government of the United States. The statement of the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMALL. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for making that statement. I only wish to put myself right with the committee and right with the citizens of Elizabeth City. This city has the reputation, deservedly, of being one of the most progressive cities in North Carolina. Its population, according to the last census, was 6,344, which represented an increase of more than 50 per cent over the census of 1890. It possesses an intelligent and progressive class of citizens. Its manufacturing interests are multiplying, and its wealth and population are increasing at a phenomenal rate. They are entitled to have a suitable public building commensurate with their needs, commensurate with the revenue and the business of the post-office there, adequate to the demands of the United States court, and also with the requirements of the custom-house.

I may say that a bill has passed the Senate and is now pending in this House to remove the custom-house from the town of Edenton to this town of Elizabeth City. While a great many may think the present site is not suitably located, they have had a fair opportunity to present the matter to our Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds if they desired to do so. That committee in its wisdom, for the reasons stated, concluded to retain the present site, in which they acted on their own judgment and responsibility, without advice or request from me, directly or indirectly.

With the consent of the House, I will include in my remarks the documents I have referred to.

A bill (H. R. 10707) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Elizabeth City, N. C.

Be it enacted, etc., That the amount heretofore fixed as the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building for the accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices in the city of Elizabeth City, in the State of North Carolina, be, and the same is hereby, increased to \$125,000, which sum is hereby fixed as the limit of cost for the erection of said building, including the cost of a site therefor.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 18, 1902.

SIR: Referring further to the request dated the 12th instant, from your committee, for a report in connection with H. R. 10707, providing for the increase of the limit of cost of the public building at Elizabeth City, N. C., from \$100,000 to \$125,000, I have the honor to advise you that it is estimated that an increase of limit to the amount stated, namely, \$125,000, will be necessary to provide for the construction of the building in a fireproof manner.

Respectfully,

H. A. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
House of Representatives.

A bill (H. R. 11909) to acquire a new site for the court-house and post-office at Elizabeth City, N. C.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise a new site in the city of Elizabeth City, N. C., and to erect thereon the Federal building authorized by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1890, payment for said new site to be made from the appropriation heretofore made for "court-house and post-office, Elizabeth City, N. C."

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized and directed to sell at public or private sale, at such time and on such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States, the land already acquired in said city as a site for said Federal building, and to deposit the net proceeds of such sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

A bill (H. R. 11910) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Elizabeth City, N. C.

Be it enacted, etc., That the amount heretofore fixed as the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building for the accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices in the city of Elizabeth City, in the State of North Carolina, be, and the same is hereby, increased to \$135,000, which sum is hereby fixed as the limit of cost for the erection of said building, including the cost of a site therefor.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 26, 1902.

SIR: This Department is in receipt from you, with request for reports thereon, of H. R. 11909, to acquire a new site for the court-house and post-office at Elizabeth City, N. C., and H. R. 11910, providing that the amount heretofore fixed as the limit of cost of said building, namely, \$100,000, be increased to \$125,000.

In connection with H. R. 11909, for the acquisition of a new site, you are advised that said bill meets with the approval of this Department, and favorable action thereon is recommended.

It is suggested, however, that the words "and directed," in line 4, page 1 of said bill, be stricken out and the words "in his discretion" be inserted in lieu thereof, the effect of this suggested change being to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to secure a new site for said building. It is also suggested that after the word "directed," in line 12, page 1 of said bill, the words "in the event of the acquisition of a new site" should be inserted.

In connection with H. R. 11910, to increase the present limit of cost to one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars (\$135,000), you are advised that it is estimated that an increase of limit to this amount will be necessary, in the event of a change being made in the location of said building, in order to provide for the erection of the building and to cover the additional cost of new site.

Respectfully,

H. A. TAYLOR,
Assistant Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
House of Representatives.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of this House for a great many years, and I am now nearer the achievement of a public building within my district than I have ever been before during all that period of time. And yet I represent a rich and growing section of a great State. I imagine that there is much lack of information in regard to the situation in the State of Ohio in the matter of public buildings. The Sixth Congressional district, represented by Mr. HILDEBRANT; the Tenth Congressional district, represented by Mr. MORGAN; the Eleventh Congressional district, which I have the honor to represent; the Fifteenth Congressional district, represented by Mr. VAN VOORHIS; the Sixteenth district, represented by Mr. GILL, occupy upon the map of the country a vast territory, extending from Cincinnati almost north to the national road and eastward almost to the city of Pittsburg, and in that whole territory of five Congressional districts and nearly 30 counties there is but a single public building, and that is located at the city of Portsmouth and cost the munificent sum of about \$30,000, as I recall. I could point to other Congressional districts in Ohio in the same condition.

There is a larger concession of public buildings in the States lying along the Pacific coast and the interior in the intermountain section in proportion to the wealth and population than there is in the State of Ohio.

Now, there are five Congressional districts to which I have pointed, and these Congressional districts, looking over them with my familiarity with the people and their purposes and their desires and their actions in the matter of public improvement, brings this suggestion to my mind: While on that vast territory there is but a single small public building, the people of these counties have erected court-houses—in some of them at a cost of upward of \$300,000—and in the little county in which I live and where I do not ask at this time for a public building we have a court-house which to-day would cost far more than the money that the little building will cost which I propose at Chillicothe.

In the city of Chillicothe there is a court-house built by taxation drawn from the people of that county, involving an expenditure in the original structure and the improvements made to it recently which, I presume, has amounted to at least \$150,000. This shows to the House that the people of the country are willing to invest their money directly in the building of public structures for the accommodation of the public business.

I find that the city of Chillicothe stands No. 77 on this list of cities in point of population, and yet her population was not quite 13,000 by the last census. There are 76 cities of a smaller population than the city of Chillicothe provided for in this bill. Nevertheless I presume that in every one of these cities that is the county seat the people of that county have built a court-house and jail, or other public building, far in excess of the cost of the appropriation covered by this bill.

Why, the schoolhouses in some of the States covered by this bill, the common schoolhouses, have cost far more money than the Government buildings here provided for.

The city of Chillicothe is located in the Scioto Valley, on a stream which runs high up in the State above the middle of the State formed by the Olentangy and another stream, and flows down through one of the richest valleys that the sunlight of heaven ever shone upon.

At the city of Chillicothe is located, of course, the post-office, which pays a rental of a large sum, considering the character of the town, and in the city we have had for a long time a collection district where is located the internal-revenue collector's office for one of the rich collection districts of the State of Ohio. It is situated about 45 miles from the Ohio River in the valley of the Scioto River which, running all the way from the capital city of the State, mingles its waters with that of the Ohio River at the city of Portsmouth. It was the ancient capital of the State of Ohio, a city famed in the early history of that Territory and that State, and it was the capital until the removal took place which carried it to a more eligible and more central section of the State.

It has been a city famous in the history of the State of Ohio. The Virginia military district covered the land titles in the Scioto Valley, and gentlemen generally are familiar with the history of those land titles. At the time of the cession by Virginia to the General Government of the territory northwest of the Ohio River the State of Virginia, which was in its early history one of the most generous and liberal of all the States of the Union to the men who had fought the battles of the country, reserved a great portion of very valuable land to be occupied by the soldiers of Virginia who had fought in the Indian wars and other wars of the country.

So it was that a large body of men, good citizens, ambitious and hopeful, emigrated from the State of Virginia into the valley of the Scioto and its tributaries, and carried with them land warrants issued by the State of old Virginia and became settlers in the new world. In the old times among these and their descendants was a large body of Whigs, but in later years when issues unknown to the earlier days came, many of them, following the teachings and impressions of Virginia politics, became Democrats.

The valley of the Scioto and its tributaries have produced many of the conspicuous and distinguished men who have crowded the pages of Ohio's history with the record of their good deeds and great achievements.

Allen G. Thurman, one of our greatest statesmen, best lawyers, and purest men, was a resident originally of Chillicothe, having been born at Lynchburg, Va., and coming with his father at an early date to the Scioto Valley. William Allen, the famous citizen of Fruit Hill, lived and died a citizen of Chillicothe, and in the beautiful cemetery on the top of the hills overlooking the city lie buried the remains of four governors of Ohio—Tiffin, McArthur, Worthington, and Allen. Here also lie the remains of Gen. Nathaniel Massie, who was entitled to have received and held the office of governor of Ohio, but because of his feeling that he ought not to take an office for which he had not received the majority vote of the people, although his opponent was ineligible, declined the office. So the remains of five governors of Ohio lie in this beautiful cemetery, from which the visitor overlooks one of the grandest panoramic views anywhere in the world, I think. The hills to the right, the hills in the front, the hills to

the left, the magnificent farms spread out like a beautiful carpet, all that can be imagined of beauty in landscape spreads itself out to the admiring gaze of the visitor.

On the east of Chillicothe is a splendid range of hills, which are memorable in connection with the early statehood of Ohio, the first great seal having engraved upon it emblems of agriculture, emblems of transportation in the form of a canal service; and the rising sun, suggestive of the glories that were to follow, makes its appearance coming up between the peaks of the high hills.

I remember one very beautiful morning starting before sunrise with President Hayes to travel from Chillicothe to Columbus by railroad. As we were passing eastward toward the station the sun was just rising, and General Hayes, who was a lover of all things of this character, stopped and pointed and said, "There is the view that suggested the old seal of the State of Ohio." For all time, no matter what changes may come, the outgrowth of the genius and intelligence of men, the great feature of the old seal of the State of Ohio will make itself apparent to the people of Chillicothe in all the coming ages.

The people who settled there were men of high distinction. I could not, without invidious comparisons or elaborate extension of my remarks, do justice to the long list of grand men who have impressed themselves and their characteristics and their patriotic purposes upon the population and action of the people of Chillicothe and Ross County.

Gen. Nathaniel Massie founded the city of Chillicothe in 1796, and selected for his permanent residence, however, a beautiful tract of land in the Paint Creek Valley, a stream tributary to the Scioto, one of the most beautiful valleys on the map of the world. But time would fail me if I attempted to speak of the grand men who settled in that neighborhood. What I have already said is hardly pertinent to the question under consideration. I have referred by name only to those who became conspicuous in the directions I have indicated.

As I have said, Chillicothe is located in one of the richest valleys in the world, and is the commercial center of that valley. A canal, still owned by the State, traverses the valley from the mouth of the river away north beyond Columbus, and railroads center in Chillicothe from all parts of Ohio. It is situated upon a great through line of railroad between St. Louis and the city of Baltimore, and thence to New York.

The inhabitants of this section of Ohio are the production of the commingling of various races. The cavaliers, to whom I have already referred, and the men of the Ohio Company's purchase, who spread themselves out from the Raccoon Valley into the Scioto Valley, commingling blood of the Puritans with the blood of the cavaliers, and making a population second in intelligence, patriotism, wealth, and character to no other population of equal size in the United States.

So, Mr. Chairman, in expending a few dollars for the purpose of erecting a public building in that city and placing upon it that flag for which the fathers and the grandfathers of the men and women of to-day fought both under the organization of old Virginia and in the achievement of her independence in connection with the colonies, as well as in the introduction of the great States into the brotherhood of States, you accomplish a purpose which, in my judgment, is commendable in the highest degree.

If I could have my way about it, there would be an American flag upon a public building in every considerable city in the Union. [Applause.] Since I have been a member of Congress I voted for a bill that would have given to every city in the Union with a population above a certain number a public building. I think now it would be money well expended to carry out such a project. I rejoice that the time has come when in planting the American flag upon any foot of the soil of the United States we need not have any fear that it will ever be looked upon again as the representative of injustice, unfairness, or oppression against the people of the United States or against the people of any other country. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN].

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that at first I thought the three hours allowed for debate on this bill would be unnecessary. But since the discussion has begun I see the necessity for such debate. I am one of those who are not satisfied with this bill, though I shall vote for it. The grounds of my objection are its omissions and its limitations, especially the limitation as to cost of sites. But, Mr. Chairman, realizing that in the present parliamentary situation this bill can not be amended in this House, it is unnecessary for me to say anything about those omissions and limitations; and, therefore, I wish to express my gratification at the recognition which this bill contains of the town of Durham, N. C.

As is well known to the chairman of the Public Buildings Committee and to every member of that committee, I have to the last

moment diligently and persistently urged that the proposition for another city in my present Congressional district should also be included in the bill. I refer to the bill introduced by me to enlarge the building at Greensboro, N. C. The omission of that meritorious project in this House bill has been to me a disappointment. Yet I have a confident hope that before Congress adjourns the Greensboro measure will become law, and I am glad to say that for the realization of that hope I have positive encouragement from the best sources. As to Durham, my predecessor in Congress introduced in the Fifty-third Congress a bill for a public building at that place. He reintroduced it in the Fifty-fourth Congress; and on the fourth day after I was first sworn in as a member I reintroduced it in the Fifty-fifth Congress, and thereafter in the Fifty-sixth and the Fifty-seventh Congresses.

In the Fifty-fifth Congress the Public Buildings Committee made a favorable report upon the bill for a public building at Durham, but that was one of the few unfortunate towns whose bills were not reached during the time allowed for the consideration of bills reported by that committee. Now, I am glad to see that Durham is included in this bill and that in all likelihood there will soon be a public building erected there. The bill that I introduced carries \$100,000, but owing to the last estimate furnished the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee by the Treasury Department, the committee put Durham in this bill at \$70,000, in accordance with that estimate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Durham is a very important town. As in the Fifty-fifth Congress, in a speech on this floor, I gave statistics regarding Durham as she then was, I want to give some as she now is. Its population, according to the last census, was 6,679, but the township of Durham under the last census had 19,055. The truth is that about 15,000 of those people belong to the town of Durham, though not within its corporate limits at the time the census was taken. The last legislature of North Carolina, which met in January, 1901, enlarged the corporate limits so that to-day my information is the corporate limits of the town of Durham contain over 12,000 people, and in addition there are some populous communities adjoining the town.

The town of Durham during the last fiscal year paid to the Government in internal revenue \$2,589,721. I notice with pleasure that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON] smiles at that great contribution which Durham made to the Federal Treasury. Practically every dollar of this internal revenue is paid upon tobacco. The receipts from the post-office during the last fiscal year were \$19,400.25. Durham is also a port of delivery. During the eleven months ending June 30, 1901, 2,046,293 pounds of manufactured tobacco were exported from this port to foreign countries, and upon that tobacco not a cent of revenue was paid.

In 1885 the post-office receipts amounted to \$5,545. In 1895 they were \$11,707; in 1899, \$14,982.90; in 1900, \$17,111.65; in 1901, \$19,400.25.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the people of Durham upon the probability of their soon seeing, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] wants to be seen everywhere in such towns, the United States flag flying from a Federal building; and I want to congratulate this House that this good town, which has been knocking at the doors of Congress for ten long years, is at last about to receive 70 per cent of the recognition which her people and their Representative think she is justly entitled, as this bill carries for her \$70,000 instead of \$100,000. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

- S. 4419. An act to incorporate the General Education Board;
- S. 3967. An act for the relief of Ramon O. Williams and Joseph A. Springer; and
- S. 1191. An act for the relief of the legal devisees of James W. Schaumburg.

OMNIBUS PUBLIC-BUILDING BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MERCER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McDERMOTT].

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, section 20 of this bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster-General, and the Attorney-General to make a report to the next session of this Congress upon the selection of a site, cost of building, etc., for a post-office in Jersey City. My understanding is that the committee desires plans and estimates before making an appropriation, and my further understanding is that this course will make but a few months' delay. Of course I would rather not have even this delay, but the bill is not, under the rule adopted, subject to amendment, and I am bound to express to the chairman of the

committee and his fellow-members my appreciation of the courtesies they have extended to me during the several hearings given to Jersey City's application. In order that the commission may have a few statistics before them and that all the members of this House may be fully informed of the conditions imperatively demanding an appropriation for Jersey City, I desire to record a fair statement of present postal facilities in that municipality.

To those members of the House who are familiar with Jersey City argument can not be necessary to prove that municipality entitled to relief from Congress in the matter of the erection of a suitable public building to be used by the postal, revenue, judicial, and other departments of the United States Government. To those who have seen the city only while in transit to New York a few facts may be of benefit in arriving at a proper conclusion. The present building was purchased under legislation enacted in 1873, and is constructed for a private dwelling house, the inside of which would not be found extensive for a family of ten members. It was purchased by the Government in 1875, and was then in a residential section, which has since, by the encroachments of manufacturing establishments and railroad lines, been almost wholly transformed. It is now, for a large majority of the population and for visitors from New York and elsewhere, inconvenient of access, miserable in appearance, furnishing an eyesore for residents, and a topic for the ridicule of visitors.

The following letter from the Treasury Department shows the cost to date:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISING ARCHITECT,
Washington, February 26, 1902.

Hon. ALLAN L. McDERMOTT, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Your letter of the 24th, instant, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, relative to the appropriations made for a post-office building at Jersey City, N. J., has been referred to this office for response.

The records of this office indicate that in pursuance of acts of Congress approved March 3, 1873, and March 3, 1875, a plat of ground at the intersection of Sussex and Washington streets, Jersey City, N. J., with a brick building thereon, which had been used as a residence, was purchased October 21, 1875, for the sum of \$70,000. In 1877, under authority of an act of July 31, 1876, this building was remodeled, and was occupied again in the latter part of that year. The total appropriations to this date were \$112,000. Subsequently there was an additional appropriation of \$4,000 for improvement of grounds, and in 1889 a one-story addition was built and some minor changes made at a cost of about \$12,000, which sum was appropriated by an act of March 30, 1888. It would therefore appear that the total amount appropriated for the building named, aside from the regular annual cost of maintenance, was \$128,000.

Trusting that this information may prove to be what you desire, I am,
Very respectfully,

J. K. TAYLOR, Supervising Architect.

Its purchase was a mistake, and its continuance in the public service is a detriment so positive that no parallel can be found in the dealings of the United States with the necessities of the people in any other section. The city is compactly built; covers an area of 13 square miles, is lighted by over 2,500 public lights, has about 250 miles of streets, and a population of over 200,000. It contains the terminal depots and lands of the Pennsylvania, Delaware, Lackawanna and Western, Lehigh Valley, Baltimore and Ohio, Erie, Philadelphia and Reading, and half a dozen other railroads. The value of its real estate, including railroad terminals, is about \$200,000,000. Millions of dollars have been expended in the erection and equipment of manufactories, and we here find the works of the American Sugar Refining Company, the Lorillard Tobacco Company, the Dixon Crucible Company, the Colgate Soap Company, the Corcoran Windmill Works, the Griffin Iron Company, and hundreds of other corporations whose correspondence reaches every part of the world. In addition to these, over 2,000 corporations doing business outside of New Jersey have their offices in Jersey City. The correspondence of these concerns alone demands greater facilities than can be afforded in the present post-office. The following letter shows the growth in postal receipts at this station:

FEBRUARY 25, 1902.

Hon. ALLAN L. McDERMOTT,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In compliance with your request of the 24th instant, addressed to the Postmaster-General, I have the honor to furnish you herewith a statement of the receipts of the Jersey City (N. J.) post-office for each fiscal year from 1878 to 1901, inclusive:

1878.....	\$12,800.33	1890.....	\$134,005.89
1879.....	41,011.82	1891.....	161,580.85
1880.....	67,020.03	1892.....	170,537.09
1881.....	59,888.82	1893.....	202,470.05
1882.....	66,798.48	1894.....	194,378.31
1883.....	72,683.20	1895.....	205,514.77
1884.....	74,736.46	1896.....	259,745.83
1885.....	75,151.50	1897.....	218,558.71
1886.....	83,001.20	1898.....	209,641.09
1887.....	82,693.59	1899.....	225,391.04
1888.....	85,277.72	1900.....	262,499.19
1889.....	119,872.44	1901.....	271,841.51

The records in this office do not show the receipts of individual offices for years prior to 1878, therefore it is impossible to furnish the record for the above office for the fiscal years 1873 to 1877, as requested by you.

Very respectfully,

W. M. JOHNSON,
First Assistant Postmaster-General.

In 1875 the receipts were less than \$38,000, and it therefore appears that there has been practically no increase in accommodation, while the business of the office has increased over 700 per cent.

So pressing are the necessities that the Secretary of the Treasury has decided that there must be an addition of some kind to the present building for immediate use. I have declined to introduce a bill for this purpose, believing that money expended in this way would be thrown away and that the immediate wants of the Department should be met by the renting of an additional building, to be used while a proper one is in course of construction. Almost every foot of space within the building is used by employees, and a dozen callers for letters must crowd each other into the street.

No other community is similarly afflicted, and no one can suggest a reason why the really great city of Jersey City should have this intolerable nuisance continued. The city has a city hall erected at a cost of over \$1,000,000, school buildings that have cost several millions, and office buildings costing from \$100,000 to \$700,000 apiece. The public spirit and business enterprise that have done these things should not be depressed by having them offset by the maintenance in the name of the National Government of a public building that would not properly answer the requirements of a city of 20,000 inhabitants. With the exception of the \$100,000 appropriation mentioned, the National Government has never expended a dollar within the city of Jersey City for an improvement of any kind, while hundreds of other municipalities have been favored far beyond their needs, and the pleas upon which these favors have been granted have not had safe foundation in any rule of governmental economy. All that Jersey City requests is that the Government of the United States shall show proper respect for itself.

Mr. MERCER. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, the committee, in the bill reported to the House, has appropriated the sum of \$20,000 for the purpose of securing a site upon which to erect a public building in the city of Johnstown. I presented to the House a bill asking for an appropriation of \$125,000 for the purpose of securing a site and erecting a public building at that place; but the committee, in its judgment, did not see proper to recognize us in our application as set forth in the bill, and instead of that made the appropriation which I have referred to in the bill.

To my mind the wants and the needs of Johnstown in this direction are many; and while I am not here complaining as against the action of the committee in this particular, yet I believe that the application in the original bill should have been recognized. Johnstown is a city situate in the central part of the great State of Pennsylvania, and the history of that city in some particulars is well known to the people of this great country of ours. She is situated in the Conemaugh Valley, and in 1889 her people were almost wiped out of existence, and a great part of the city was destroyed by the dreadful flood which occurred in that year. Yet we find that in 1890, the year following the flood, the population of that city was some 21,000 people, and in 1900 the population had increased to some 35,000 people.

In order to indicate to the House the needs of this city for a public building, I wish to call attention to the receipts and expenditures for the year 1901 of the post-office in that city. In 1901 the total receipts for the fiscal year were \$47,764.92, and the total expenditures were \$22,657.70, leaving for the year 1901 a net revenue of over \$25,000. Yet we are accorded only \$20,000 for the purpose of obtaining a site for this city. We find that we are in a somewhat helpless condition, because we can not move an amendment to increase the amount in this bill. We should have been glad if we could do so; but however that may be, it does seem to us that the amount accorded is commensurate with the extent of the business in that city.

Now, the information before the committee as to the cost of a site on which to locate a building in this city ranged, I believe, from \$35,000 to over \$50,000. I very much fear that the amount appropriated in this bill will not be sufficient to secure a site in a desirable location in the city. However that may be, we desire to be in a position to lay before the House the needs and wants of the city as based upon the amount of business which is done there.

The total population of the city, as I have already said, is over 35,000, but there are adjacent boroughs that do their business through the Johnstown post-office, and the population of those adjacent boroughs amounts to something in the neighborhood of 14,000 people, making a total population doing business through that office of over 50,000 people.

Now, in glancing over the list of appropriations made for buildings in Pennsylvania I can say that but a single one of the cities named is greater in population than the city of Johnstown, and only a single one of these show an amount of receipts flowing through the post-office greater than those in Johnstown.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while we appreciate our helpless position, we hope that the action of the committee in this bill has placed us on the highway to securing that to which we feel that we are entitled. [Applause.]

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EVANS] that he has done all in his power to convince the committee that a building should be authorized at Johnstown.

The city of Johnstown is peculiarly situated. The topography of the country is unusual, and the building space in that city is confined within very narrow limits. The city government of Johnstown owns a piece of ground 66 feet square, and when the delegation from that enterprising city came before our committee evidence was offered that most likely the city would donate that much of ground for a site, and that additional ground could be purchased which would enlarge the site satisfactorily and at a cost not to exceed twenty or thirty thousand dollars. The remark was dropped that possibly \$20,000 would satisfy the requirements for the purchase of additional ground. The distinguished gentleman [Mr. EVANS] is inclined to think it will take more money than that. The Treasury Department in its estimate to the committee indicates that \$25,000 will be sufficient. Our information is that \$20,000 will be ample, and I am inclined to think that the enterprising citizens of Johnstown will see to it that the Government obtains a site within those figures.

In reply to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McDERMOTT] I desire to say that Jersey City is one of the largest cities in the East without a commodious public building. The Government of the United States has already expended in Jersey City \$147,539.08 toward the purchase of a site and the construction of a building in that city. The present site cost in the neighborhood of \$71,390, and was purchased August 15, 1875. The same site to-day can not be sold for over \$25,000 or \$30,000. It is in size 200 feet by 100 feet, but is situated in that part of Jersey City where land values have decreased. The business center of the city has gradually moved westward. To purchase a site for Jersey City will cost a good deal of money, and the committee was not satisfied with the data it had before it to act thereon without further information; and it has recommended in this bill a further investigation of the situation at Jersey City.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McDERMOTT] has been very diligent in this matter, has been before the committee several times, and has responded to all inquiries put to him in reference to this matter, and I trust in the early future that Congress will find itself justified in furnishing that enterprising city with a commodious public building.

Mr. VANDIVER. I did not hear all that the gentleman said; but I understood him to say that that had been purchased there in 1875 for \$75,000, and no building erected on it yet.

Mr. MERCER. The gentleman really misunderstood me. The Government purchased a site at that time, but at that time there was a building on the site. It was a private residence belonging to a wealthy man of that day, and the Government has utilized the building, with the additions added to it since, up to the present time.

Mr. VANDIVER. But the gentleman says at the present time that it would not sell for \$25,000?

Mr. MERCER. I do not think it would sell for over \$25,000.

Mr. VANDIVER. How does the gentleman account for that wonderful decline in value?

Mr. MERCER. Because business has moved away from that portion of Jersey City, and the valuable portion of the city is now in a different direction from that in which the present office is situated. The gentleman is aware in a city such as Jersey City the business center sometimes moves from one place to another, and in Jersey City it has actually left the place where the present office is situated.

Mr. VANDIVER. Does the gentleman think the commission will ascertain the fact that it was not a reasonable investment when it was made?

Mr. MERCER. I have been informed that the Government paid really more than it should have paid at the time the property was purchased.

Mr. VANDIVER. I should think so.

Mr. McDERMOTT. If the gentleman will allow me to answer the gentleman from Missouri—

Mr. MERCER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McDERMOTT. In 1875 property in the vicinity of the present post-office site was very valuable for residential purposes, but, in my opinion, at least 30 per cent more than its real value was paid for the property. Since then the uses to which property in this vicinity is put have been wholly changed. The site is not now convenient for carriers or the public. Of course there are differences of opinion as to where the post-office should be located, and, after going over the available sites with the chairman of the committee, I am not inclined to scold because he and the

others of the committee have decided to leave the selection to a commission. After that commission has decided the character of building Jersey City is entitled to, I think it would be well to advertise for proposals for a site; but whether this course or some other is pursued, I am satisfied that a commission composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney-General, and the Postmaster-General will recommend that which will meet the approval of the people of Jersey City.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes which I have I only desire to enter my own protest against this method of appropriating public money. I have no doubt but what there are many public-building bills included in this which ought to pass. I am equally certain that there are those without merit, or very little, if any, and in order to secure the appropriation where it is deserved in this bill you are compelled to vote for appropriations which you feel are not meritorious. There would be just as much reason for the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to bring their bill before this House under such a rule, preventing any amendment or change in a single item.

If the Committee on Rules of this House proposes to adopt this system of appropriating the public money, and the members of this body sanction it, the time will come when appropriation bills other than such as this will be put through in such method. It is simply enlarging the powers of the Committee on Rules. All you have to do is to satisfy that committee, or a majority of it, that these items are right and ought to be passed. There is as much justification to adopt a rule for the benefit of the Committee on Appropriations to put through any appropriation bill that comes into this House without any amendment whatever, requiring the members to vote for every item.

Mr. MERCER. Will the gentleman permit me an inquiry?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. MERCER. I believe the gentleman was a member of the Fifty-fourth Congress?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. No, sir; I was not.

Mr. MERCER. The Fifty-fourth Congress passed a river and harbor bill with twenty minutes' discussion, covering \$60,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. That does not make it right. I do not know whether it was open to amendment or not. I was not in that Congress.

Mr. MERCER. It was not open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Was it under suspension of the rules?

Mr. MERCER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Then it was passed under the rules of the House, and two-thirds of the members voted for it.

Mr. MERCER. Two-thirds of the members are in favor of this bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I suppose if you have two-thirds of the members in the bill, that is true. [Laughter.] But, Mr. Chairman, that does not justify this proceeding. I care not whether a precedent has been established or not, it ought not to be followed. You have often heard of appropriations being log-rolled through the State legislatures, but I never have witnessed a system of more public barter in legislation than is now going on in the House of Representatives. What does the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds do when a member introduces a bill? They virtually say we will put your bill on the Calendar. We will report it favorably, providing that you will vote for 175 others that we are going to report. If that is not bribery, what is it in parliamentary language?

Now, I suppose the gentlemen who have public buildings in this bill feel under obligations to support it, and will. I am not prepared to say that in such a case members of Congress do not owe some duty to the public in general as well as to the people of the town or city in which the public building is to be located. Now, you might just as well bunch together all the pension bills that are brought before this House and logroll them through without amendment. Make the good bill pull through the bad bill. The time to stop this practice is in the beginning, and if you continue it this same rule will be adopted by other committees in the appropriation of public money, and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this will be the last time that 175 or 200 bills appropriating money are linked together in order that those that have merit may pull through those that have none.

Mr. MERCER. Is the gentleman from Illinois in favor of economy in these matters?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. If I thought the gentleman from Nebraska was ever sincere, I would answer him; but my observation is that he simply tries to make a little fun in order to get his bill through.

Mr. MERCER. If I was trying to make fun of the gentleman from Illinois, I would show his picture; I would not say anything about him. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Oh, it is admitted by all the members in the House that the gentleman from Nebraska is one of the handsomest men that ever came to Congress [laughter]; exceedingly handsome; and I do not have to prove it, because the gentleman from Nebraska admits it. [Laughter.] I hope, while I am not as handsome as the gentleman, I have more courtesy than the gentleman showed toward the gentleman from New York this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman, I take pleasure in yielding to the gentleman two minutes more of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I accept that as sufficient consideration for the compliment paid him. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt but that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds are just as careful in their consideration of these matters as any other committee, but it is simply assuming that the bills which they report are perfect and that this House is not capable of improving them.

I am not objecting to the bringing in of the several public-building bills all in one bill, but I say this House ought to have the right to amend, to strike out, and insert, and if there is a place in it where they are trying to appropriate money which ought not to be appropriated, the House ought to have the opportunity to remedy it. I do not know how meritorious they all are. I see one town of 1,800 people where they have an appropriation of \$100,000. It may be right. I see another town, in Iowa, of 8,000 people, where the Treasury estimate was \$75,000. The committee, in its generosity, has allowed \$100,000. Perhaps an examination and discussion of the case would show that the other \$25,000 was necessary or ought to be stricken out.

I only refer to this to show that the proper way to deal with these questions is to give an opportunity to amend and to strike out and insert, the same as you do in the river and harbor bill and in other appropriation bills. I say the effect of it is that when you lump together a large number of bills in which a majority of the House of Representatives are interested and put them all into one bill, members are induced to vote for it that you could not induce to do a wrong with any amount of money, and yet it is a form of bribery and nothing else; and I do not believe the people of the United States, when they get an understanding of the reckless methods by which their money is being appropriated in this way, will give it their approval. [Applause.]

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, we have 400 bills before the committee, aggregating not less than \$67,000,000, and if we had come into the House with all these public-building bills I am afraid my friend from Illinois would have been sadly disappointed from an economical standpoint, for in that case the authorizations would have been nearer \$60,000,000 than the amount in this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I had no hope that less money would be appropriated, but it might go where it ought to go if it was considered and appropriated by the judgment of this House.

Mr. MERCER. Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that, so far as I know, no one else desires to address the Committee of the Whole, I desire that the report of the committee be read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GROSVENOR). The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent—

Mr. CREAMER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the proposition and then the gentleman from New York will be recognized to make objection. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be read in his time. Is there objection?

Mr. CREAMER. I object.

Mr. MERCER. I did not ask unanimous consent. I asked that the report be read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made; and the Chair will state to the gentleman that when objection is made a paper can not be read in Committee of the Whole except by a vote of the committee. The gentleman is at liberty to make the motion.

Mr. MERCER. Well, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CREAMER] has objected, I desire to say that the following is the report made by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. [Mr. MERCER proceeded to read the report.]

Mr. FINLEY (interrupting the reading). Will the gentleman yield to a motion that the report of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be read at the Clerk's desk?

Mr. MERCER. I will.

Mr. FINLEY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make that motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MERCER. I desire to thank my friend from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY].

The Clerk proceeded to read the report.

The CHAIRMAN (when the reading had proceeded some time). The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MERCER] has expired.

Mr. MERCER. I ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to yield to me so much of his time as will permit the reading of the report to be finished.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will yield the gentleman all of my time except five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will stop the reading at such a point that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] will have the five minutes which he reserves.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the report.

Mr. MERCER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the rest of the report be printed in the RECORD without reading.

There was no objection.

The entire report is as follows:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 14018) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes, respectfully recommend the passage of the same and report thereon as follows:

Over 400 bills authorizing public building legislation have been introduced and referred to this committee. The sum total thereby requested amounts to over \$65,000,000. The demand for public buildings not only comes from the States and Territories, but we have had it from Porto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii, all of which gives evidence of the fact that the Republic is growing with astonishing rapidity. The business of the Government keeps pace with the general growth of the country, but Congress seems to lag in its relief. It is impossible to meet all the demands of the country at this session of Congress, but let us hope that this effort of the committee will be followed by a general desire on the part of Congress and the country that those cities where buildings are inadequate, or where new buildings are needed and which have not been recognized in this bill, may reap their reward at an early date. This bill carries an increase in the limit of cost of 58 public buildings now erected or in process of erection, providing for additions, repairs, or the purchase of additional ground in order that the present site may be enlarged.

Total authorization for increase.....	\$5,111,450
Treasury estimate.....	10,792,950

Section 2 provides for the erection of public buildings upon ground owned by the United States Government. In San Francisco the present custom-house is an old building, having been erected and occupied in 1856. The importance of San Francisco as a shipping center and customs district justifies Congress in this authorization. Pending the destruction of the present building and the erecting of a new building the customs officials can be temporarily housed in the appraisers' stores building, thus saving to the Government pay for rent of temporary quarters.

In Emporia, Kans., a site was authorized by the Fifty-first Congress. The Fifty-fifth Congress authorized the purchase of sites in Hastings and Norfolk, Nebr., as United States courts are held in these cities.

In Guthrie, Okla., a public square has been reserved to the Government for the use of public buildings.

Total authorized for the above six buildings.....	\$1,236,000
Treasury estimate.....	2,230,000

Section 3: Several cities in the United States have offered to donate to the Government of the United States satisfactory building sites. This committee has recognized in this section the more meritorious propositions, there being sixteen, at a—

Total authorization of.....	\$1,835,000
Treasury estimate.....	2,305,000

Section 4 authorizes the purchase of sites and the erection thereon of public buildings within a fixed limit of cost. Seventy-eight cities are recognized.

Total authorization.....	\$8,548,000
Treasury estimate.....	10,782,000

Section 5: In this section the committee authorizes the purchase of sites in 16 cities within a limit of cost fixed. The committee believes that a public building should be erected in each of the cities named in this section, but not being able to justify an authorization now, thought it advisable to buy sites before they increased in value. It would be economy for the Government to secure building sites in cities where public buildings are contemplated as far in advance of the authorization as possible.

Total authorization.....	\$675,000
Treasury estimate.....	4,600,000

Section 6: The city of Washington, with about 300,000 population and the capital of the Republic, is without a municipal building. Her servants are crowded in rented quarters poorly lighted and overcrowded. Your committee is of the opinion that the time has come to relieve this "long-felt want," and in this section the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a municipal building is authorized. It is to be located south of Pennsylvania avenue upon the only available vacant square of ground to be obtained in this locality. In this connection the committee desires to go on record as favorable to the improvement of Washington. We look upon this city not simply as a municipality in the District of Columbia, but rather as the capital of the richest nation on earth, and we feel that as our capital it should receive encouragement and assistance from all sections of the nation. Washington belongs to the people of the United States, and they will rejoice at all efforts made by Congress to beautify and improve her surroundings. The few people who live in Washington should not be expected to bear the brunt of taxation for such purposes. Your committee hopes for the time when public-building legislation in Washington will be along broad, not narrow, lines.

The authorization for increases of limit of cost, as provided for in section 1 of this act, are based upon Treasury estimates, but the committee, after very careful consideration, has made allowances below the estimates furnished.

The only large increases are at New York City and Cleveland, Ohio. In the former place the custom-house has a commanding location on the Battery overlooking the bay, and in order to have the material in construction of the same kind throughout the building it is necessary to increase the limit of cost. The building when completed will serve New York City for several generations.

In Cleveland the Government engineer, by borings, discovered a defective foundation. The old building, now razed to the ground, was erected upon a crust of hardened earth and gravel, and a few sky scrapers in Cleveland in the immediate locality are similarly situated. Recent borings show that beneath the crust is a lake of sand about 34 feet deep, and in order to secure a safe and permanent foundation for a heavy building, as is to be the Federal building which will be erected upon the present site, more expensive work will be necessary than originally contemplated. Cleveland has in contemplation a so-called "group plan" for public buildings, and desiring to have the Government building as the corner stone of such a plan, the change in lines of site is authorized. If Cleveland carries out her present purpose of grouping the new court-house, city hall, art gallery, auditorium, and other public buildings with reference to the lake and the Federal building, and surrounds each building with parking, Washington will have a rival city for the reputation of being the most beautiful city in the world.

The city of Richmond, Va., needs relief; but the present building, which is historical as well as permanently constructed, can be made most acceptable by enlarging the site so that it will face both Main and Tenth streets. Your committee provides for an enlargement of the site. When that is done the present building can be enlarged and renovated into one of the best public buildings in America, and in a very economical manner. In this connection your committee includes a brief history of the present Federal building at Richmond:

"Among historic structures owned by the United States the Federal building in this city is perhaps richer in association with notable men and events than any building owned by the Government outside of Washington.

"It was built just in time to be occupied by the Confederate government. President Davis and his cabinet and General Lee and his officers were familiar figures about the building in the war period.

"Afterwards, when the Federals regained possession, an indictment was returned in this building against President Davis, whose final release, under bond, a year later, took place also in this building.

"Recently the Treasury Department asked the custodian of the building for a brief sketch of the structure. In response Mr. John S. Bethel, custodian, has prepared and forwarded to Washington the following history of the building:

"MR. BETHEL'S SKETCH.

"SIR: I have the honor to inform the Department, relative to information asked for by letter dated the 10th instant, that this building is located on Main street, between Tenth and Eleventh streets. It fronts on Main street and also on Bank street. It was finished and occupied in the year 1858. It was extended on the Bank street front, and two wings were added on the Main street front. These additions were completed in 1887. The character of the building is dressed granite, with wood and iron finish on the inside.

"The population of the city when this building was first occupied was 36,000; the estimated population now is 100,000. The Government never owned any building in this city before it built this one.

"HISTORICAL EVENTS.

"When the State of Virginia seceded from the Federal Union, in April, 1861, the State took charge of this building and used it for various purposes until the Confederate government was transferred to this city from Montgomery, Ala., in July, 1861, when they took charge of this building and installed here the treasury department of the Confederate States, from which were issued all the bonds and currency used by the Confederacy.

"Jefferson Davis, the president of the Confederacy, had an office on the third floor of this building, in which he and Gen. Robert E. Lee and other famous generals sometimes met for consultation.

"The secretary of state, Judah P. Benjamin, and the secretary of the treasury, together with the auditor and treasurer, occupied rooms in this building. Room No. 17 was used for cabinet meetings by the Confederate government.

"There was also stored in this building, up to April 2, 1865, the gold and silver of the Confederate States government, which on that date was transferred south. On the following day it was occupied by Federal troops, and afterwards placed under control of the Treasury Department.

"INDICTMENT OF DAVIS.

"In this building, on May 10, 1866, the grand jury of the United States circuit court indicted Jefferson Davis for treason. On May 13, 1867, he was brought into this building on a writ of habeas corpus, and was immediately released under bond given on that date by Horace Greeley, Franklin Stearns, Charles O'Connor, and others.

"Since that time nothing of unusual importance has transpired.

"Respectfully,

"JOHN S. BETHEL, Custodian.

"THE SUPERVISING ARCHITECT.

"Treasury Department, Washington, D. C."

Section 6: A new post-office, court-house, and custom-house building has been constructed in Kansas City, Mo., but the needs of the service require space, and as the Treasury Department advises the sale of the old building, it was thought wise to invest the proceeds thereof in completing the new building as originally designed. This can be done without expense for additional ground, as the site upon which said new building has been erected is amply large for that purpose, being bounded on the north and south each 252 feet by Eighth and Ninth streets, respectively, on the west 289 feet and 14 inches by Grand street, and on the east 289 feet by McGee street. The old building and site located on the corner of Ninth and Walnut streets, in Kansas City, including alterations and repairs, has cost the Government up to June 30, 1901, the sum of \$387,000.19, the site having been purchased July 5, 1879. The bill provides that said site and building shall be sold for not less than \$300,000.

Section 8: The purpose of this section is to give St. Louis a model post-office building. The post-office has outgrown the space allotted to it in the Government building and must be given relief. The fact that a great industrial exposition will be held in St. Louis, Mo., in 1904, alluring to the city millions of people and increasing the work of the post-office in a marked degree, only aggravates the situation.

The space now occupied by the post-office in the Government building can be occupied to a greater advantage by other Federal offices which are now housed in rented buildings.

Strange as it may seem, yet it is a fact, the best arranged post-office building in the United States—and, for that matter, in the world—is a temporary structure on the lake front in Chicago, and the experience of the postal authorities in that building convinces your committee that in all cities of the size of New York, Chicago, and St. Louis the post-office business should be confined in a separate building, divorced from all association with courts, customs, revenues, etc. An ideal post-office building should have plenty of ground space, good light, ventilation, and high ceilings. It should occupy an entire block or square of ground surrounded by streets and near a union depot. Such a building need not be an expensive one, yet expensive enough to be permanent. A steel frame with brick and terra cotta would serve the purpose admirably, and the economy of such a structure would encourage Congress to duplicate such a building in other large cities.

Section 9 authorizes the purchase of a site for a Federal building in New Orleans, La.

The present site was ceded to the United States June 29, 1848, by the first municipality of New Orleans, and building operations were commenced soon after. In 1860 the walls had been carried up 75 feet above the concrete base to the architrave line of the entablature and all the floor beams of the fourth story were in place. The discovery was then made that the building was slowly sinking, the maximum settlement in 1880 being 2 feet 6 inches, in spite of the fact that a commission in 1881 reported, from borings made, that the site was the firmest, driest, and most reliable in the city. Your committee has unofficial information that the total settlement of the building to date is about 4 feet. At this rate of speed through the earth the Chinese Government may some day occupy a building which housed Gen. B. F. Butler during the civil war. The post-office department should be removed and the space vacated given over to the customs service. The present building above the basement will be serviceable for many years, but a new building is needed for the post-office department and other offices in said city for which the Government is now paying rent.

Section 10: In 1854 the site in Providence, R. I., upon which the post-office building is now located, was purchased for \$40,000. The present building was completed in 1857. The total cost of site and building to June 30, 1901, is \$328,765.55. The city of Providence offers to donate to the Government as a site for a new building a tract of land in Exchange place, directly opposite a magnificent city hall, and within a stone's throw of a beautiful State capital building, the site to be donated being worth about \$500,000. The postal situation in Providence is bad, very bad, and patient indeed have been the people in that vicinity in waiting until now for relief. The present building and site can be sold when the new building is completed for almost as much as they have cost the Government to date.

Section 11: The present site in Wheeling, W. Va., was purchased September 7, 1855, for \$20,000, being 132 feet square in size. Building was completed in 1860. The cost of site and building, including additions and repairs, to June 30, 1901, is \$177,362.39, the original cost of the building being \$96,618.64. The United States district judge refuses to hold court in the building on account of its condition, and for the further reason that the building being close to the railroad tracks noise from the engines and cars makes the transaction of business impossible, and when there is a rise in the Ohio River the basement fills with water. The situation in Wheeling justifies the action taken by your committee. A new site will be purchased sufficiently large and satisfactorily located to permit the erection thereon of a building that will serve Wheeling for many years to come.

Section 12: In the Fifty-fifth Congress legislation was enacted authorizing an appropriation of \$58,000 to enlarge the present site and improve the present building at Macon, Ga. The appropriation followed, but the Treasury Department, owing to a rise in building material, was unable to execute the legislation provided by Congress within the limit of cost thereby fixed. The Treasury Department has submitted another estimate to the committee, and section 12 is responsive thereto.

Section 13: For several years the post-office building in New York City has been crowded, especially in the basement and on the first floor. Temporary relief has been given the Post-Office Department from time to time, but all efforts to relieve the congested condition in the present building have proven futile, and your committee are satisfied that the only permanent satisfactory remedy is a new building devoted exclusively to post-office business.

A building can not be erected until a site is selected, and as it will take from six months to two years to agree upon a suitable site, owing to the divergence of opinion as to location, your committee have decided to authorize the purchase of a site through a commission composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster-General, and the Attorney-General of the United States. The selection of this commission evades local jealousies and bickerings. To create a commission composed of citizens of New York or presidents of business organizations in said city would only involve the selection of a site, where land is valuable and the location of a site uncertain, in quarrels and complications which should be avoided. Until a site is selected the Government can not properly determine the character of building that should be erected. The committee are anxious to help New York and the country, and have provided for a full report by the commission as to style, size, and cost of building to be constructed. As soon as the site is selected a building will be authorized.

Section 14 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to either purchase a new site under certain conditions or add to the present site in the city of Toledo, Ohio. If the citizens of Toledo will aid the Government in buying a suitable site within the limit of cost fixed it is probable that Congress will provide for the authorization of a new building. Toledo is a large and growing city, and whatever action is taken the effect of it should be to provide ample accommodations for all the Federal offices that may reside in said city during the next fifty years.

Section 15 authorizes the purchase of a site in Des Moines, Iowa. The present site was acquired October 6, 1866, for \$15,000. The building was occupied in 1871. Two additions have been made to the building since 1871, the total cost of building and site to June 30, 1901, being \$590,038.21.

The post-office in Des Moines does more business than any post-office in the United States in proportion to the population of the city, the gross receipts now amounting to almost \$400,000 per annum, and to the credit of the postmaster there this office is one of the most economically managed offices in the United States, as only 28 per cent of the gross receipts are consumed in transacting its enormous business. The net receipts of the office for six months will buy the new site. A new building is a necessity in Des Moines now, and in two or three years it will be an imperative necessity. True economy suggests the purchase of a site now, and the building can follow as soon as the departments are fully decided as to size and character of building needed.

Section 16 authorizes the sale of the old Government building and site in Buffalo, N. Y. This site was purchased January 22, 1865, for \$45,000. The total cost of building and site to June 30, 1901, is \$553,973.72. The building has been enlarged and renovated several times, as the original cost of construction was \$150,839.09. The Treasury Department recommends the sale of the property, as the Government has no further use for it and will be under expense in protecting it. The conservative judgment of business men in Buffalo is to the effect that the site and building is not worth more than \$100,000. Your committee, after careful consideration of all information furnished bearing upon values, has decided to make the minimum limit of selling price \$125,000. The new Government building in Buffalo is occupied, the old building having been vacated some time ago.

Section 17 authorizes a new building in Los Angeles, Cal. In 1880 about 11,000 people resided in this city; in 1890 there was a population of 52,000; in 1890 over 102,000, and in 1902 about 120,000. The growth of this city is phenomenal, and with the discoveries of oil lately made in that vicinity, added to other conditions which tend to make large cities larger, it is economy for the Government in erecting a public building there to build for the future and along very liberal lines. On January 7, 1887, a site was purchased for \$28,635.13, and an addition thereto was purchased May 26, 1900, at a cost of \$20,053, total cost of site being \$48,688.13, with a frontage of 182 feet 9 inches on Main street. This property is now very valuable. Blunder after blunder has followed legislation affecting

the public building in Los Angeles. The first authorization was for \$150,000, and work was commenced in February, 1889.

In September, 1889, when the masonry had reached the second-floor level, the Treasury Department suspended work, anticipating that Congress would increase the limit of cost to \$500,000 and provide for an enlargement of the site. Congress having failed to act, work was resumed in 1891 and building occupied in summer of 1892. Under appropriations approved March 21, 1895, and June 11, 1896, aggregating \$17,000, alterations were made in the building, and a one-story extension, 25 by 60 in plan, was constructed at the south end. An act of March 3, 1899, provides for an extension of building and purchase of additional ground, and limits cost of same at \$250,000. This legislation was brought about through a Senate amendment to a bill providing an increase of limit of cost of public building at Stockton, Cal., and was passed by the House of Representatives over the protest of your committee.

Events which have transpired since then justify the action of your committee in opposing at that time the Senate amendment above referred to. To make matters worse, the Federal officials in Los Angeles have moved from the present building to rented quarters, the post-office building has been razed to the first story, and an attempt made to erect a new structure upon the old foundation and first floor. The Treasury Department, satisfied that no suitable building could be constructed within the present limit of cost, suspended work, and requests Congress to legislate with reference to the size and growing necessities of the city. The provisions of this section are so drawn as to encourage your committee in believing that at last justice will be done Los Angeles and the Government at the same time properly protected. Elsewhere in this act provisions have been inserted which will render it impossible to impose upon the Government, as has been done in Los Angeles since 1889.

Section 18 authorizes a new building in Burlington, Vt. The present site, bounded on the north 222 feet by Main street, on the west 316 feet by Church street, was purchased May 5, 1855, for \$7,520, and the total cost of building and site to June 30, 1901, is \$91,400.52, the original cost of building being \$44,714.91. The building is entirely unsuited for its purpose, the Federal court and Federal officials being obliged to occupy a State building. The post-office is so badly crowded that rented offices are necessary to relieve the situation. The net receipts of the business transacted in the Burlington post-office for a period of three years will pay for the new building, which is to be erected upon the present site.

Sections 19 and 20 regulate sizes of sites, rent of buildings, advertising, and inspection of sites.

Section 21 seeks to prevent delays in the construction of public buildings, and in justification of its action your committee submits a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury relating thereto.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 3, 1902.

SIR: Considerable difficulty has at times been experienced by this Department in its efforts to enforce, through the courts, stipulations for liquidated damages for delays in contracts for the erection or repairs of public buildings because of the lack of uniformity in the construction of such stipulations by the courts and the want of a Federal statute on the subject.

When contracts are awarded for the construction or repair of public buildings under the control of this Department it sometimes happens that, having a due regard for the convenience of the Government, the moving consideration for the acceptance of a particular bid is the time within which the bidder agrees to complete the work embraced in his bid, and where, under these circumstances, the Government buys time, so to speak, and lets work to a bidder based on the consideration of time being of the essence of the contract, it is unjust to the United States and unfair to competing bidders to say that recovery shall be had for no more than the actual damages sustained by the United States, and that the element of inconvenience to the public and the Government in being deprived of the use of the public building shall not be considered.

The attitude of the courts in favor of construing as penalties wherever possible all stipulations for liquidated damages is founded upon principles which in the main are humane and just, but it results in rendering possible, under certain circumstances, the most vexatious delays, with no other remedy on the part of the Department than the abrogation of the contract and the reletting of the same, a method in itself always attended with more or less delay.

If a Federal statute were enacted bearing on this subject it would put all men on notice that in all contracts for public-building work under the control of this Department persons legally competent to contract would be held strictly to their contract stipulations as to damages.

It seems to this Department that whenever Congress makes an appropriation for a public building or other public work that it should be presumed that a necessity exists therefor, and that being true it lies in the power of neither the Department, the contractors, nor the courts to determine with exactness the damages sustained by the public or the Government in being deprived of the use of such public building or other public work, and hence when parties to a contract agree in advance what those damages shall be such stipulations ought to be subjected to no different construction or interpretation than any of the other stipulations of the contract.

There is inclosed herewith a draft of suggestive legislation which this Department deems would prove effective, and I have the honor to recommend that the same, or some other provision having the like object in view, be incorporated in one of the general appropriation bills, preferably the sundry civil, under the heading "Public buildings."

Respectfully,

L. M. SHAW,
Secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
House of Representatives.

Section 22 authorizes an investigation of certain Federal buildings for the relief of which bills are pending before your committee, but the conditions of which are not sufficiently known by your committee to warrant action by it at this session of Congress.

Section 23 repeals an act authorizing the Department of Justice building in Washington. In the Fifty-fifth Congress \$1,025,000 was appropriated, \$25,000 thereof to pay for the removal of the Department of Justice to rented quarters and for rent of same, the \$1,000,000 being for the erection and completion of a Department of Justice building upon the site opposite Lafayette Square in said city, owned by the Government of the United States, it being understood that no part of the \$1,000,000 was to be expended unless a suitable building could be erected and completed within the limit of cost fixed.

In the Fifty-sixth Congress the Attorney-General came to your committee for an increase of \$900,000, which was refused. As the site referred to is not large enough for a building such as should be erected for the purposes intended, your committee is of the opinion that the law should be repealed and the money heretofore appropriated, save and except the \$25,000 allotted for purposes above set forth, should be returned to the Treasury of the United States and a full report made to Congress.

In consideration whereof your committee respectfully recommends the passage of H. R. 14018.

Bills pending before the committee asking for authorizations amounting to \$60,975,936, by States, Territories, and District of Columbia.

Alabama.....	\$298,000	New York.....	\$7,072,300
Arkansas.....	225,000	North Carolina.....	550,000
California.....	3,085,000	North Dakota.....	200,000
Colorado.....	1,575,000	Ohio.....	2,905,000
Connecticut.....	800,000	Oregon.....	310,000
Florida.....	815,000	Pennsylvania.....	1,828,000
Georgia.....	1,430,000	Rhode Island.....	1,625,000
Illinois.....	1,645,000	South Carolina.....	550,000
Indiana.....	1,325,000	South Dakota.....	475,000
Iowa.....	1,885,000	Tennessee.....	890,000
Kansas.....	300,000	Texas.....	1,515,000
Kentucky.....	1,179,000	Utah.....	200,000
Louisiana.....	2,090,000	Vermont.....	350,000
Maine.....	575,000	Virginia.....	1,905,000
Maryland.....	150,000	Washington.....	2,400,000
Massachusetts.....	3,778,200	West Virginia.....	920,000
Michigan.....	1,815,000	Wisconsin.....	940,000
Minnesota.....	575,000	Wyoming.....	200,000
Mississippi.....	180,000	New Mexico.....	100,000
Missouri.....	1,147,500	Oklahoma.....	200,000
Montana.....	475,000	Alaska.....	50,000
Nebraska.....	1,070,000	Hawaii.....	1,200,000
Nevada.....	60,000	District of Columbia.....	12,811,986
New Hampshire.....	200,000		
New Jersey.....	1,155,000	Total.....	66,975,986

Statement showing apportionment by States, Territories, and District of Columbia of the authorizations carried in H. R. 14018.

Alabama.....	\$140,000	New Jersey.....	\$315,000
Arkansas.....	225,000	New York.....	1,552,250
California.....	1,050,000	North Carolina.....	125,000
Colorado.....	345,000	North Dakota.....	125,000
Connecticut.....	325,000	Ohio.....	991,000
Florida.....	75,000	Oregon.....	160,000
Georgia.....	295,000	Pennsylvania.....	758,000
Illinois.....	528,000	Rhode Island.....	1,000,000
Indiana.....	550,000	South Carolina.....	255,000
Iowa.....	615,500	South Dakota.....	280,000
Kansas.....	141,000	Tennessee.....	350,000
Kentucky.....	180,000	Texas.....	500,000
Louisiana.....	200,000	Utah.....	125,000
Maine.....	197,000	Vermont.....	185,000
Maryland.....	50,000	Virginia.....	318,000
Massachusetts.....	293,200	Washington.....	270,000
Michigan.....	342,500	West Virginia.....	475,000
Minnesota.....	318,000	Wisconsin.....	490,000
Mississippi.....	155,000	Wyoming.....	100,000
Missouri.....	678,000	Oklahoma.....	100,000
Montana.....	50,000	District of Columbia.....	1,575,000
Nebraska.....	525,000		
Nevada.....	60,000	Total.....	17,405,450
New Hampshire.....	80,000		

Statement showing in detail the apportionment of authorizations in H. R. 14018.

	Popula- tion, 1900.	Amount allowed.	Treasury estimate.
Alabama:			
Montgomery.....	30,000	\$85,000	\$85,000
Selma.....	8,713	75,000	108,000
Arkansas:			
Fort Smith.....	12,000	100,000	135,000
Harrison.....	1,551	75,000	84,000
Batesville.....	2,327	50,000	
California:			
San Francisco.....	342,782	700,000	1,500,000
Fresno.....	12,470	100,000	160,000
Los Angeles.....	102,479	250,000	700,000
Colorado:			
Denver.....	133,839	200,000	300,000
Colorado Springs.....	21,000	135,000	220,000
Leadville.....	12,455	10,000	10,000
Connecticut:			
Hartford.....	80,000	150,000	250,000
Waterbury.....	52,000	135,000	
Torrington.....	8,390	40,000	60,000
Florida:			
Tampa.....	15,839	40,000	40,000
Gainesville.....	3,633	35,000	125,000
Georgia:			
Atlanta.....	89,872	170,000	165,000
Athens.....	10,245	75,000	138,000
Brunswick.....	9,081	80,000	80,000
Rome.....	7,291	6,000	150,000
Macon.....	23,272	14,000	67,000
Illinois:			
Decatur.....	20,754	80,000	85,000
Evanston.....	19,259	90,000	90,000
Ottawa.....	10,588	50,000	87,000
Pekin.....	8,420	70,000	100,000
Jacksonville.....	15,073	60,000	100,000
Kankakee.....	13,586	70,000	67,000
Springfield.....	34,159	100,000	150,000
Sterling.....	6,309	5,000	75,000
Monmouth.....	7,460	1,000	1,000
Indiana:			
Muncie.....	20,942	75,000	120,000
Richmond.....	18,226	75,000	150,000
Vincennes.....	10,249	75,000	100,000
Elkhart.....	15,184	75,000	100,000
Hammond.....	12,376	125,000	175,000
Logansport.....	16,204	75,000	100,000
Crawfordsville.....	8,000	50,000	
Iowa:			
Marshalltown.....	11,544	85,000	90,000
Centerville.....	5,256	35,000	50,000
Boone.....	8,880	100,000	75,000
Iowa City.....	7,987	60,000	80,000
Waterloo.....	12,580	150,000	150,000
Ottumwa.....	18,197	6,500	6,500
Des Moines.....	62,139	125,000	650,000

Statement showing in detail the apportionment of authorizations, etc.—Cont'd.

	Popula- tion, 1900.	Amount allowed.	Treasury estimate.
Iowa—Continued.			
Oskaloosa	10,000	\$4,000	\$9,000
Burlington	23,201	20,000	20,000
Atlantic	5,046	30,000	-----
Kansas:			
Emporia	8,223	41,000	55,000
Lawrence	10,862	50,000	80,000
Hutchinson	9,379	50,000	67,000
Kentucky:			
Paducah	9,446	70,000	75,000
Richmond	4,605	20,000	20,000
Henderson	10,272	40,000	72,000
Maysville	8,000	30,000	70,000
Louisiana:			
New Orleans	237,104	200,000	250,000
Maine:			
Augusta	11,683	150,000	150,000
Bangor	21,850	35,000	35,000
Bar Harbor	4,379	6,000	70,000
Calais	7,655	6,000	-----
Maryland:			
Cumberland	17,128	50,000	50,000
Massachusetts:			
Quincy	23,889	12,000	80,000
Northampton	18,643	70,000	70,000
Holyoke	45,712	135,000	150,000
Amesbury	9,473	45,000	47,000
Lynn	68,513	1,200	1,200
Michigan:			
Battlecreek	18,563	80,000	110,000
Owosso	8,696	35,000	80,000
Muskegon	20,818	70,000	85,000
Adrian	9,654	40,000	55,000
Grand Haven	4,743	50,000	55,000
Flint	13,103	60,000	75,000
Menominee	12,818	1,500	1,500
Sault Ste. Marie	10,538	6,000	-----
Minnesota:			
Minneapolis	202,718	250,000	250,000
Stillwater	12,318	50,000	80,000
Albert Lea	4,500	3,000	75,000
Fergus Falls	6,072	15,000	25,000
Mississippi:			
Biloxi	5,067	100,000	170,000
Jackson	7,816	5,000	5,000
Natchez	12,210	50,000	70,000
Missouri:			
St. Louis	575,238	550,000	550,000
Louisiana	5,131	35,000	40,000
Nevada	7,641	40,000	87,000
Joplin	20,023	35,000	50,000
St. Joseph	102,000	18,000	-----
Montana:			
Butte	30,470	50,000	-----
Nebraska:			
Lincoln	40,169	300,000	350,000
Hastings	7,188	125,000	125,000
Norfolk	3,883	100,000	115,000
Nevada:			
Reno	4,530	60,000	85,000
New Hampshire:			
Nashua	23,898	80,000	90,000
New Jersey:			
Elizabeth	52,130	135,000	135,000
Atlantic City	27,838	115,000	180,000
New Brunswick	20,006	15,000	10,000
Perth Amboy	17,699	50,000	75,000
New York:			
Rochester	162,608	40,000	150,000
Binghamton	39,647	2,250	2,250
Ithaca	13,136	70,000	75,000
Gloversville	18,349	75,000	70,000
Niagara Falls	19,457	75,000	220,000
Little Falls	10,381	50,000	68,000
Kingston	24,535	80,000	100,000
Buffalo	352,387	35,000	35,000
Jamestown	22,892	35,000	35,000
New York City	3,437,202	1,000,000	1,550,000
Geneva	10,433	75,000	-----
Saratoga Springs	12,409	15,000	85,000
North Carolina:			
Durham	6,679	70,000	70,000
Goldsboro	5,877	35,000	80,000
Elizabeth City	6,344	20,000	25,000
Greensboro	10,035	-----	75,000
North Dakota:			
Grand Forks	7,652	125,000	180,000
Ohio:			
Findlay	17,613	55,000	90,000
Warren	8,529	45,000	50,000
Cleveland	381,768	500,000	700,000
Sandusky	19,664	20,000	20,000
Chillicothe	12,976	70,000	95,000
Zanesville	23,538	110,000	110,000
Toledo	131,822	125,000	500,000
Youngstown	44,885	14,000	-----
Hamilton	23,914	12,000	130,000
Ironton	11,868	40,000	55,000
Oregon:			
Portland	90,426	10,000	10,000
Portland	90,426	150,000	150,000
Pennsylvania:			
Washington	14,000	60,000	65,000
Westchester	9,524	50,000	-----
McKeesport	34,227	100,000	100,000
Oil City	13,264	60,000	85,000
Lebanon	17,628	75,000	90,000
Norristown	22,265	78,000	80,000
Johnstown	35,936	20,000	25,000
Newcastle	28,339	125,000	125,000

Statement showing in detail the apportionment of authorizations, etc.—Cont'd.

	Popula- tion, 1900.	Amount allowed.	Treasury estimate.
Pennsylvania—Continued.			
Allentown	35,416	\$100,000	\$150,000
Easton	25,238	60,000	90,000
Philadelphia Mint	-----	25,000	25,000
New Brighton	6,820	5,000	5,000
Rhode Island:			
Providence	175,597	1,000,000	1,000,000
South Carolina:			
Spartanburg	11,395	60,000	70,000
Florence	4,647	100,000	155,000
Rockhill	5,485	35,000	45,000
Georgetown	4,138	40,000	-----
South Dakota:			
Deadwood	3,478	200,000	216,000
Aberdeen	4,087	75,000	75,000
Pierre	2,306	5,000	200,000
Tennessee:			
Memphis	102,320	150,000	250,000
Greenville	1,817	100,000	145,000
Nashville	-----	100,000	290,000
Texas:			
Dallas	42,638	100,000	150,000
Waco	20,686	100,000	210,000
Laredo	13,429	125,000	160,000
Sherman	10,243	100,000	-----
Beaumont	9,427	75,000	175,000
Utah:			
Ogden	20,000	125,000	220,000
Vermont:			
Burlington	18,640	170,000	175,000
Newport	1,874	25,000	25,000
Virginia:			
Richmond	85,050	75,000	1,100,000
Charlottesville	6,449	75,000	75,000
Martinsville	2,384	35,000	40,000
Portsmouth	17,427	15,000	125,000
Alexandria	14,528	60,000	65,000
Newport News	19,635	50,000	50,000
Norfolk	46,624	8,000	10,000
Washington:			
Seattle	80,241	150,000	250,000
Tacoma	37,714	60,000	600,000
Spokane	36,848	60,000	500,000
West Virginia:			
Wheeling	38,878	400,000	400,000
Huntington	11,923	75,000	175,000
Wisconsin:			
Superior	31,091	175,000	225,000
Green Bay	18,648	140,000	150,000
Fond du Lac	15,110	60,000	65,000
Eau Claire	17,517	30,000	65,000
Baraboo	5,751	35,000	65,000
Wausau	12,354	50,000	61,000
Wyoming:			
Evanston	2,110	100,000	200,000
Oklahoma:			
Guthrie	10,506	100,000	260,000
District of Columbia:			
Municipal Building	-----	1,500,000	-----
National Bureau of Standards	-----	75,000	-----

* Kansas City, sale of old building.

* Buffalo, sale of old building.

* Also sale of old building.

* Wheeling, also sale of old building.

SUMMARY.

Limit of cost of 58 public buildings increased:	
Treasury estimate	\$10,792,960
Increase authorized by this act	5,111,450
Authorization under estimate	5,681,500
Purchase of sites and erection of buildings thereon authorized in 77 cities:	
Treasury estimate	10,782,000
Authorization by this act	8,548,000
Authorization under estimate	2,234,000
New buildings authorized upon sites owned by the Government in 6 cities:	
Treasury estimate	2,230,000
Authorization by this act	1,236,000
Authorization under estimate	994,000
New buildings authorized upon donated sites in 17 cities:	
Treasury estimate	2,305,000
Authorization by this act	1,345,000
Authorization under estimate	470,000
Purchase of sites in 16 cities:	
Treasury estimate for sites and buildings	4,690,000
Authorization by this act	675,000
Authorization under estimate	4,015,000
Total Treasury estimate	30,799,960
Total authorization	17,405,450
Authorization under estimate	13,394,500
Total authorization	17,405,450
Less amount covered into Treasury by repealing Department of Justice act	\$1,000,000
Less amount of proceeds of sale of buildings	585,000
	1,585,000
Net authorization by H. R. 14018	15,820,450

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains an appropriation for improving the public building in Macon, Ga., the city of my residence, in addition to that already provided by law. In the Fifty-fifth Congress—in 1899—I secured an appropriation of \$58,000 to extend, improve, and enlarge that building so as to provide the necessary accommodations for Government business. Upon investigation by the Treasury Department it was ascertained that that sum was wholly inadequate to carry out the purpose intended, and therefore no part of that sum has been expended.

It was admitted by the Treasury Department and by the Committees on Public Buildings and Grounds of this House and the Senate in 1899 that the present building, which was erected in 1888, was absolutely inadequate and insufficient. But after that appropriation was secured the Secretary of the Treasury, at my solicitation, has not used a cent of it, but has recommended additional appropriation.

At the present session of Congress I introduced bills for the purpose of increasing the appropriation to \$300,000 and one to erect a new building if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, that was necessary. The Secretary of the Treasury has written three letters on the subject, which I will read—two to the Committees on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate and the House and one to Senator BACON. In the one dated February 26, 1902, and which has been read by the chairman [Mr. MERCER], he states that an additional appropriation of \$65,000 would be sufficient—at least, that was what was intended. For reasons which are unnecessary to be stated now, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, while I am satisfied, desiring to do that which was just and proper to the people of Macon, to give to the city of Macon the additional sum necessary to make that building sufficient to answer the demands of the Government, misunderstood the recommendations of the Treasury Department and included in this bill only \$72,000, being only \$14,000 more than the \$58,000 which was appropriated in 1899.

Finding that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds had made this mistake in the bill now before the House as to his meaning, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States has written the letter of the 25th instant to that committee stating that after careful investigation he believes that in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$67,000 is absolutely necessary to provide the building at Macon with sufficient room and accommodations to carry on the business of the Government. This letter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 25, 1902.

SIR: Under date of February 28, 1902, this Department had the honor, in compliance with your request, to submit for your consideration a report and estimate in connection with H. R. 10590, providing for the acquisition of additional land and the construction of an addition to the public building at Macon, Ga., and H. R. 11094, providing for the erection of a new public building on the present site or upon a new site.

An item of \$58,000 was provided by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1899, for the extension and enlargement of the present Federal building at Macon, Ga., and for the purchase of additional land for the site thereof, and in submitting the report above referred to this Department's estimates were based upon such an enlargement of the building as was contemplated at the time said appropriation was made, and included only sufficient money to cover the increased cost of building materials.

The Department has more carefully considered the matter of the proposed enlargement of said building, and in view of the rapid growth of the city and the increase in the volume of the Federal business which is transacted in said building, it is found that \$125,000 will be required for additional land and for the erection of a suitable extension, including the necessary changes in the present building; which will necessitate an appropriation, in addition to the \$58,000 heretofore provided, of \$67,000.

Respectfully,

L. M. SHAW,
Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
House of Representatives.

I present now a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to the senior Senator from Georgia, which is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 26, 1902.

SIR: In reply to your communication of this date in regard to measures pending in Congress providing for the erection of an addition to the public building in that city and for the erection of an entirely new building I have the honor to advise you that it is the opinion of this Department that the best interests of the public service would be subserved by providing for the acquisition of additional land adjoining the present site, and for the erection on said site, as enlarged by said additional land, of a new building, in order that adequate accommodations may be provided for the present and probable future requirements of the public service.

The Committees on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate and House have been advised that a suitable building to provide for the needs of the service at Macon can be erected for \$275,000, and that the necessary additional land can be secured for \$25,000, making the total estimated cost of new building and additional land \$300,000, and the Department is still of the opinion that this amount will be sufficient.

In this connection you are advised that building methods have greatly improved since the present building at Macon was constructed, and it is now feasible to construct a new building for the sum of \$300,000, including cost of necessary additional land, which would be much better adapted in every way to the needs of the public service at Macon.

You are further advised that on yesterday the Department reported to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House that the sum of \$125,000 would be required to remodel and enlarge the present building and to acquire the additional land necessary for the purpose, said report having been sent to the committee upon the suggestion of Hon. C. L. BARTLETT, who represents the Macon district in Congress, and who was of opinion that it would be impossible to secure a new building.

Respectfully,

M. E. AILES,
Assistant Secretary.

Hon. A. O. BACON, United States Senate.

So that it will be observed that in the opinion of the officials of the Government the city of Macon is entitled to have appropriated for enlarging the public building there at least \$125,000, and that the best business proposition for the interest of the Government would be to build a new building to cost \$300,000. I am assured that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds misunderstood the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury contained in his first letter, and when the letter of the 25th was received and read that committee instructed the chairman to amend the bill by striking out \$72,000 and inserting \$125,000, and the chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MERCER] has assured me that he will do so before this bill becomes a law; that he will ask unanimous consent of the House to permit this amendment to-day, or that he will see to it that the committee of the Senate so amends the bill, and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House has by resolution directed its chairman to so amend this bill. So I am satisfied that by the efforts I have made in the interest of the people of my city I shall eventually secure for the improvement of the public building there at least the sum of \$125,000, and, while this amount is not sufficient to build a new and more expensive building, it will be such as, in the opinion of the officials of the Treasury Department, will for some time to come answer the purposes of the Government at that city.

While, by reason of the rule under which this bill is now being considered, I can submit no proposition to amend it in any respect, I hope, yes, I know, that an opportunity will yet be given—if not in the House, certainly in the Senate—to so amend the bill as to carry out the suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury and meet in a measure the wishes contained in the petition which I hold in my hand from the citizens of Macon, which contains 2,240 signatures.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to detain the committee, and will ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain statements.

There was no objection.

The petition referred to, and a copy of which follows, is signed by all the public officials, both of the United States and the State of Georgia, county and municipal officers, business men, and men of all professions and callings. It was filed by me in the House and presented to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and is as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States in Congress assembled:

The petitioners, citizens of Macon, Ga., and of the territory in the jurisdiction of the United States court for the southern district of Georgia, respectfully petition your honorable body to make provision for the erection in said city of a public building commensurate with the dignity of the Government of the United States and convenient for the transaction of its public business.

POST-OFFICE.

Petitioners respectfully represent that the small and insufficient public building in said city was erected in 1888. It was from the first inadequate for the sole purpose for which it was designed, namely, the sessions of the United States courts, and for the local post-office. From the first the post-office authorities have been gravely embarrassed by the narrow and restricted space assigned to it. This was injurious to the service, and jeopardized the security of the mails. The post-office has more than doubled its business since 1888, and is now, in the volume of mail handled, the third in importance in the State of Georgia. In 1888 it had 5 carriers. It now has 22. At that time the free-delivery system covered a small area of the city. It now extends over the greater portion of the county of Bibb, with daily distribution to nearly 60,000 people.

In addition to the carrier force the office contains 13 clerks besides the postmaster and his assistant, and is the headquarters for 35 railway postal clerks and 1 inspector. Said office receives and dispatches 72 mails per day in a space which, circumscribed and inconvenient in 1888, is now totally insufficient for the purpose to which it is devoted. Should the ratio of increase in business which has been maintained during the last five years continue, the efficiency of the office, unless relief should soon be had, will be seriously affected.

UNITED STATES COURT.

The space set apart for the United States circuit and district courts and the juries, grand juries, and officers thereof is painfully inadequate. There is but one court room. The referee in bankruptcy is compelled to rent quarters from private parties. The United States commissioner is compelled to hold his hearings in the clerk's office, to the grave interference with the duties of the clerks. There is but one room set apart for the circuit and district judges. This is so small that when a fire is kindled in the fireplace the judge is compelled to screen the furniture to prevent injury thereto and danger of the destruction of the building.

There is but one jury room, and that very small and uncomfortable. When two juries are deliberating, as is frequently the case, one must be sent to the grand jury room in the garret, and if the grand jury is in session and one jury is out, the court is practically compelled to suspend the trial of jury cases. When the circuit judge has visited the district, he and the district judge are compelled to occupy the same small room, about 15 by 16 feet. There is no witness room, and when witnesses are sequestered they are

compelled to remain for hours in the hall, with great discomfort and danger to health.

In the many important trials held at Macon, when a large number of witnesses are congregated, it is on this account impossible to preserve decorum in the avenues leading to the court room. The business of the courts has largely increased. The official residence of the United States judge for the southern district of Georgia is Macon, and many cases of the largest consequence are here tried, with great inconvenience to the public and to counsel from a distance and from other States on account of the meager accommodations provided for the court.

This district embraces the large cities of Macon, Savannah, and Augusta, and many other important cities and towns, and the entire seacoast of Georgia. It comprises 68 counties and contains a population greater than that of the entire State of Florida. Its charming climate has induced the settlement of large numbers of people of high character from Northern States, notably at Jekyl Island and Thomasville. It possesses enormous interests in pine lands and the largest naval-stores interest in the world. Notwithstanding its immense resources, and that the exigencies of the public service may often so require, it would be impossible to hold in this building sessions of the circuit and district courts at the same time.

THE CLERK'S OFFICE.

While the provisions for the judges and the court are inadequate, a much more alarming matter is the insecure provision made for the court records. These are of the first importance, and millions of values depend upon their security. There are two rooms, one very small, provided for the clerks. These are already crowded with the files and records. These are rapidly accumulating, and no more space can now be utilized for this purpose.

There are two small vaults on the second floor of the building for the greater security for the records. These vaults are now crowded to their utmost capacity, and besides are in no sense fireproof. They are constructed of brick, and are supported by cast-iron pillars, which would immediately collapse if any considerable fire should break out in the lower story. The condition of these records, in which the public and the Government have so much interest, is therefore precarious in the extreme. To illustrate the importance of these facts, in one case alone there are deposited in the clerk's office original deeds of 200 different parties as evidence in litigation involving 300,000 acres of land claimed by a citizen of New York.

In view of the peculiar features of this case, if those deeds should be destroyed by fire it would be practically impossible to determine the rights in issue. There is no designated room for attorneys who desire to examine records, no consultation room for counsel, and no place where a lawyer can consult with his client except in the open hall. It is also true that while the judges are in consultation with counsel at chambers that all other attorneys or persons who desire a conference are compelled to wait in the open hall.

THE MARSHAL'S OFFICE.

The accommodations for the marshal's office are even more insufficient than those for the clerical force. To use the vigorous language of the marshal, "the entire space set apart in the present building for the marshal and his deputies can hardly be called a room. From its size and shape it could more properly be denominated an auger hole in one corner of the building." It is, in fact, a very small, circular room, and if one-half of the books of the marshal were opened it would cover the entire space set apart to him. This is the disbursing officer for the court, who pays out many thousands of dollars per annum.

The accuracy of his accounts is of the highest importance and he is compelled to carry his books into the court and the single jury rooms so that his accounts may be spared the interruption caused by the multitude of jurors, parties, and witnesses who seek his office for information. Indeed, the bar tables in the court room are much worn because the marshal has found it necessary, during the recess of the courts, to use them for the purposes of his bookkeeping, and his officers are continually carrying backward and forward from one room to another the heavy books and dockets necessary for the record of his business. This officer should have at least three large rooms, while now he is crowded into a turret as vile in architectural appearance as it is useless and inconvenient for the public service.

THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE.

In the one small room of the United States attorney there are habitually crowded four occupants—Mr. Erwin, the district attorney; Mr. Akerman, his assistant; Mr. R. E. Storrs, his clerk, and Mr. J. N. Talley, the official court stenographer. The requirements of the department compel him to have three filing cases in his office. His library is in three bookcases. There are two desks, two typewriter stands, a washstand, a stand for a water cooler and another for the letterpress, and with the necessary chairs the room is crowded beyond endurance. Here, too, assemble persons making inquiries, Government witnesses, defendants' counsel, internal-revenue officers, all witnesses seeking discharge on their subpoenas, and many others who have business with the district attorney.

It is therefore wholly impossible for the legal representatives of the Government to do any careful work in this office, and, in fact, the district attorney himself has been compelled, at his own expense, to rent offices in another building in order to secure the necessary privacy. The business of this office has largely increased. The district attorney formerly had no assistant. He now has two. The center of population in Georgia, as indicated by the late census, is fast moving southward, and the business of the office will, in all probability, increase rapidly for many years to come. There should be a room for the district attorney, a room for his assistant, another for his clerk, and a room for the official stenographer.

OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

There are, moreover, several departments of the public service which are represented in the Macon public building which were not here when it was designed. Here is the headquarters for a pension examiner. He has no room whatever. Here is now the headquarters for a division for internal-revenue collections, and the revenue agent with two deputy collectors, with the records, are crowded into a small circular space in the turret above the office of the marshal. There, too, is the stamp collector, the weather observer, and his assistant.

The rooms of these last two valuable officials of the Department of Agriculture are in what was once the cupola of the building, erected, presumably, for the purpose of ornamental architecture and as a cogn of vantage from which to float the Stars and Stripes. It is, however, true that the necessities of the Weather Bureau have rendered the amputation of the cupola necessary. The lofty minaret thereon has been removed, the altitude reduced by many feet, and on the flat roof of the abbreviated tower, from which once floated the ensign of our country, there may now be seen from all parts of the city a doubtless useful and necessary wooden structure, bearing a strong resemblance to a chicken coop, and the flag, when exposed at all, must be ignominiously thrust at half-mast out of a window. The building is indeed an architectural monstrosity, and is as discreditable to the Government as it is injurious and inconvenient to the people of Macon and the southern district of Georgia.

COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES ELSEWHERE.

Atlanta, already possessing a building three times the size of this, through the activity and public spirit of its distinguished Representative and of our distinguished Senators in Congress, has had \$500,000 appropriated for a new structure. Augusta, with judicial business trivial in amount to that compared with the business at Macon, has witnessed the erection and has long enjoyed the use of a beautiful and spacious public building about twice as large as that here. In Savannah, where the Government already possesses a massive structure noted for its architectural beauty, more than \$400,000 has been expended in the erection of a spacious and exquisite creation of the highest architectural skill for the Government service.

This beautiful building, ample for the public necessities for perhaps a century to come, constructed of marble from our Georgia mines, its walls of Parian white, and its entablatures glowing with the richer and variegated hues selected from those marvelous deposits, is at once an exemplification of our resources, an ornament to our beautiful seaport, a witness to the skill of our national architects, and an example of the generosity of our Government, while here in our own beautiful Macon, a population much larger than that tributary to Savannah, is compelled to suffer from the abortion herein described, which seems to have been carefully designed for the inconvenience and discomfort of its occupants and as a specimen of architecture as irremediable as hideous.

INSUFFICIENCY OF BUILDING RECOGNIZED BY CONGRESS.

The insufficiency of this building at Macon has been distinctly recognized by your honorable body by the appropriation of the sum of \$58,000 for its alteration and improvement. With a clear conception of the impossibility of improving the present structure, the people of this community, its governing bodies, its chamber of commerce, the bar association, and the public generally protested against the use of the public money for this impossible and useless purpose, thus presenting, perhaps, the only case on record where a community, with the general welfare at heart, has declined to receive a substantial appropriation which the law had provided should be expended among its people.

This fact in itself, we respectfully submit, should strengthen the present appeal to your honorable body for a judicious and sufficient expenditure from the public funds to relieve us of the inconvenience and embarrassment and dangers to the public safety hereinbefore set forth. In view of these facts, we respectfully pray such measure at your hands as will cause to be set aside out of the public funds the sum of \$500,000 for the purchase of a suitable lot and for the erection of a public building in the city of Macon, Ga., at a spot convenient to the public, that such building be constructed according to the best plans of modern architecture, and, if possible, build of granite or marble taken from the quarries of our own State, and to be designed for the use of the United States courts and post-office in this city, and such other offices of the Government as may be deemed appropriate by the proper authorities. And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray, etc.

Mr. BARTLETT. The original is signed by 2,340 petitioners, whose names are omitted here.

The Macon post-office is the third in the matter of receipts in the State of Georgia. The present building was erected in 1888. The following are the postal receipts:

1888	\$35,709.42
1900	69,060.93
1901	74,532.03

The following letter from the postmaster gives the condition of the room and space used for the post-office and the needs for additional space:

MACON POST-OFFICE, OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER,
Macon, Ga., February 26, 1902.

SIR: I have the honor to report that a special committee from the chamber of commerce, assisting in a movement to provide for this city a larger public building, have requested me to prepare a statement showing the conditions which surround the Macon post-office. Complying with the request, I herewith transmit the following, and ask that a copy of the same be furnished to said committee on application.

The post-office has more than doubled its business since 1888, and is now, in the volume of mail handled, the third in importance in the State of Georgia. In 1888 it had 5 carriers. It now has 22. At that time the free-delivery system covered a small area of the city. It now extends over the greater portion of the county of Bibb, with daily distributions to nearly 60,000 people. In addition to the carrier force the office contains 13 clerks, besides the postmaster and his assistants, and is the headquarters for 33 railway postal clerks and one inspector. Said office receives and dispatches 72 mails per day in a space, which, circumscribed as inconvenient in 1888, is now totally insufficient for the purpose to which it is devoted. Should the ratio of increase of business which has been maintained during the past five years continue, the efficiency of the office, unless relief should soon be had, will be seriously affected.

To enter into details, it may be added that the money-order department of this office is located in a semicircular tower room on the first floor, about 20 by 15 feet in dimensions, which necessarily contains eight pieces of furniture besides chairs and shelving. There is no vault connected with this room, and the records are exposed to the dangers of fire and water. The funds of the Department as well as the money-order blanks are kept in a small safe. This department issued during the last fiscal year about 17,000 money orders and paid about 54,000, besides handling the deposit of many Georgia offices. The total amount of money handled approximated \$1,300,000. An assistant has been granted the money-order clerk, but there is no space in the room for his desk.

The registry department is a larger room and about as badly crowded. It is the headquarters for the registry clerk, his assistant, and a post-office inspector. The vault attached to this room is at times too small to hold registers and office supplies. There is insufficient desk and case space, and during the busy season the floor of the room is used for the division and temporary storage of valuable packages. Overcrowding in the closets in the judiciary department, immediately above this room, have from time to time flooded it, endangering the safety of valuables in course of transmission and the health of the clerks employed.

The working room of the post-office is crowded to its limits by the necessary desks and cases of 22 carriers, 13 clerks, and 2 special-delivery boys. The space for opening incoming mails has been reduced by crowding to 12 by 12, and within the last ten days there has been at times as many as 18 sacks of mail piled in it. Within this space four or five men must work. The four rural-route carriers work at little desks that are not sufficient at times to pile their mail on. In this working room are piled at this writing \$1,400 worth of stamped envelopes and postals. The office stock of envelopes and

postals are so deposited for the reason that the second vault will not hold it. Special-request stamped envelopes for business firms are held until delivery in the postmaster's office for the same reason.

A portion of the working room is cut off by wire screens for scale room, second-class matter to be dispatched, passageway to the registry for the use of railway clerks, 35 in number, and for the general-delivery department.

The postmaster's room is about 18 by 18; is occupied by the postmaster and his assistant and eight pieces of furniture. Here a large amount of business is transacted with the public direct, 65 employees are paid off, all complaints handled, office records kept, and a large correspondence conducted. The assistant postmaster should have a separate and larger room, with four times the vault space. Circumstances growing out of the postmaster's position, his office as custodian, his relation to the public, and his conferences with inspectors make it advisable for him to have the benefit of a private or consulting room.

To sum up the situation, the business of the Macon office has largely outgrown its accommodations, and is necessarily handled yearly with increasing inconvenience and insecurity.

Respectfully,

H. S. EDWARDS,
Postmaster.

Hon. H. C. PAYNE,
Postmaster-General, Washington, D. C.

From this it will be seen how immensely the business of the post-office has increased, and how insufficient the post-office room is for the business of the Government. The net proceeds to the Government from this office was nearly \$45,000 for the year ending March 31, 1901.

The two other cities of the southern district of Georgia where court is held are Augusta and Savannah. From the following statement of the clerk of the United States court it will be seen that the business transacted at Macon is more than at either of the other two cities, and in some instances equal to the combined business of both. At Augusta and Savannah the Government has erected handsome and commodious public buildings, costing in the one \$200,000 and in the other \$500,000. It is but just and fair that the Government should provide quarters for the court and other public officials in some measure commensurate with the needs of the Government and the business transacted there.

Statement of the clerk of the United States circuit and district courts of the cases filed in those courts at Savannah, Augusta, and Macon since the last report to the Department of Justice, covering a period of six months.

Civil causes filed at Macon.....	62
Civil causes filed at both Savannah and Augusta during the same period.....	50
Criminal cases in the western division at Macon.....	76
Criminal cases at Savannah and Augusta, same period.....	37
Bankruptcy cases in western division, filed at Macon.....	215
Bankruptcy cases filed at both Savannah and Augusta, same period.....	348

It will be noted that the western division of the southern district of Georgia comprises 28 counties, and the eastern and northeastern divisions together comprise 48 counties.

The following table, compiled from the report of the last census, illustrates the marked growth of the population of the western division of the southern district of Georgia, for which the United States court is held in the Government building at Macon:

Population, by counties, of the western division of the southern district of Georgia.

County.	Population.		Increase.
	1890.	1900.	
Baker.....	6,144	6,704	560
Baldwin.....	14,608	17,768	3,160
Bibb.....	42,370	50,473	8,103
Butts.....	10,565	12,805	2,240
Calhoun.....	8,438	9,274	836
Crawford.....	9,315	10,368	1,053
Dodge.....	11,432	13,975	2,543
Dooly.....	18,146	20,567	2,421
Dougherty.....	12,206	13,679	1,473
Hancock.....	17,149	18,277	1,128
Houston.....	21,613	22,641	1,028
Jasper.....	13,879	15,033	1,154
Jones.....	12,709	13,358	649
Laurens.....	13,747	25,908	12,161
Lee.....	9,074	10,344	1,270
Macon.....	13,183	14,083	900
Mitchell.....	10,906	14,767	3,861
Monroe.....	19,137	20,682	1,545
Pike.....	16,320	18,761	2,441
Putnam.....	14,842	13,438	-1,404
Pulaski.....	16,559	18,489	1,930
Sumter.....	22,107	26,212	4,105
Telfair.....	5,477	10,083	4,606
Twiggs.....	8,195	8,716	521
Upson.....	12,186	13,670	1,482
Webster.....	5,695	6,618	923
Wilcox.....	7,980	11,067	3,117
Wilkinson.....	10,781	11,440	659
Total.....	384,765	455,238	70,473

*Decrease.

The increase in the population of Bibb County, in which the city of Macon is situated, as well as of the city of Macon, is shown by the following table, which is also compiled from the census returns of 1900:

Population of Bibb County, by militia districts.

District.	1890.	1900.
No. 481, Godfrey.....	4,290	6,489
No. 482, Warrior.....	1,675	2,025
No. 483, Howard.....	1,791	2,063
No. 514, East Macon.....	3,777	5,078
No. 519, Hazzard.....	1,194	1,370
No. 520, Rutland.....	2,440	2,359
No. 1985, Vineville.....	4,547	7,787
Total.....	19,624	27,201
Macon city:		
Ward 1.....		4,061
Ward 2.....		6,199
Ward 3.....		5,724
Ward 4.....		7,288
Total.....	22,746	23,272
Population of county.....	42,370	*50,473

*Gain, 8,103.

To ascertain the population within the delivery limits of the Macon post-office there should be added to the population of the city of Macon the population of the following districts lying outside the corporate limits of the city:

Districts.	1890.	1900.
East Macon.....	3,777	5,078
Godfrey.....	4,290	6,489
Vineville.....	4,547	7,787
Macon.....	22,746	23,272
Total.....	35,360	*42,626

*Gain 7,296.

Macon is a beautiful city, situated very near, if not in the exact geographical center of the State of Georgia; has well-paved streets, lighted by electricity, several handsome public buildings and private residences, attractive parks, a first-class system of waterworks, with a daily capacity of 10,000,000 gallons of pure filtered water; two distinct systems of electric railways, with tracks permeating every section of the city and suburbs.

The population of Macon, as shown by the census of 1900 and as set forth in the table just referred to, is 23,272, but there is a population of 42,626 within the delivery limits of the post-office, the city having a number of populous suburbs which are not within its corporate limits. In 1890 there was a population of 35,360 within the delivery limits of the post-office, showing a gain within the past ten years of 7,296.

Several of the most important educational institutions of the State of Georgia are located at Macon. In Bibb County there are 31 public schools for whites and 18 for colored children, with an average attendance of 3,296 white pupils and 2,200 colored.

Mercer University, for boys, and Wesleyan Female College, the oldest college for ladies in the United States, and probably the oldest in the world, are among the leading educational institutions of the State and of the South.

St. Stanislaus is a Roman Catholic college for the training of priests, and the Mount de Sales Academy is a school for girls under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Church.

There is also a normal school for ladies and a normal school for colored pupils.

The Georgia Academy for the Blind, with two departments, one for white and one for colored pupils, is also located in Macon.

There are three orphanages in the city of Macon—the Appleton Home, under the auspices of the Episcopal Church; the Orphans' Home of the South Georgia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and the Mumford Industrial Home.

Other charitable institutions are the city hospital, the Julia Parkman Jones Home for indigent ladies, under the auspices of the Episcopal Church; the Roff Home, with hospitals attached, for the poor of Bibb County; the Home for the Friendless, and Door of Hope, etc.

Macon is the terminal point of five important lines of railroads, as follows: The Georgia Southern and Florida, from Macon to Palatka, Fla., the general offices and shops of which are located at Macon; the Southwestern, connecting the city with all the important points of south and southwest Georgia; the Macon, Dublin and Savannah, extending from Macon to Savannah, with shops and general offices located at Macon; the Macon and Birmingham, extending from Macon to Lagrange, Ga., with connecting lines from that place to Birmingham, Ala., Montgomery, Ala., and New Orleans, the shops and general offices of which are located at Macon; the Macon and Northern, from Macon to Athens, Ga., with division offices and general shops located at Macon.

Macon is also on the line of the Southern Railway from Atlanta to Brunswick, Ga., with division offices and shops located at Macon, and on the line of the Central of Georgia Railway, from Atlanta to Savannah, Ga., and owning and operating the Ocean Steamship Company, with a line of steamers from Savannah to New York. Macon is the headquarters of two divisions of the Central of Georgia Railway and of the general shops of the company.

The aggregate value of property in Bibb County is \$16,427,686, of which \$14,768,000 represents the value of property in the city of Macon.

There are located in the city of Macon 5 cotton mills, 3 iron foundries, 3 cotton compresses, 3 cornice-making establishments, 3 cotton-gin manufactories, 6 cotton-press manufactories, 2 large cotton-oil companies, 1 large fertilizer factory, 1 large candy and cracker factory, 1 large ice plant, 1 barrel factory, 1 harness-making establishment, 1 pants factory, 3 large lumber mills (including sash, door, and blind factories) and 4 flour and grist mills.

Macon has 8 banking establishments, with an aggregate capital, surplus, and undivided profits of \$2,063,500.

There are 182 manufacturing establishments, representing a total investment of \$5,076,005, giving employment to 263 salaried officials and clerks and 3,700 wage-earners, the amount paid in salaries being \$272,138 and in wages \$1,047,437. The value of the annual output of these manufacturing establishments is \$6,495,767.

I would call especial attention to the notable growth in the population of the following counties in the western division of the southern district of Georgia:

LAURENS.	
1900.....	25,908
1890.....	13,747
Gain.....	12,161
Or 88.4 per cent.	
TELFAIR.	
1900.....	10,083
1890.....	5,477
Gain.....	4,606
Or 84 per cent.	
DOOLY.	
1900.....	26,567
1890.....	18,146
Gain.....	8,421
Or 46.4 per cent.	

Mr. Chairman, these are the claims of the people I have the honor to represent for fair, just, and liberal consideration at the hands of Congress in the matter of making provision for a suitable building in which to transact the business of the Government, and I feel assured that in the near future their demands will be adequately complied with.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman, in response to the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] I desire to submit two letters from the Treasury Department, which I ask may be now read by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MERCER] asks unanimous consent that certain documents which he sends to the Clerk's desk may be read. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The documents are as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 28, 1902.

SIR: Referring further to the request dated the 12th instant, from your committee, for a report in connection with H. R. 10590, providing for the acquisition of additional land and the construction of an addition to the public building at Macon, Ga., and H. R. 11094, providing for the erection of a new public building on the present site, or upon a new site, I have the honor to advise you as follows:

An addition which it is thought will meet the requirements of the service at Macon can be constructed for \$65,000. The previous estimate of the cost of contemplated extension was made in 1898, being \$58,000; which amount was appropriated under date of March 3, 1899. Owing, however, to the rise in cost of building materials, it is estimated that the contemplated extension will cost \$65,000, as indicated above.

In connection with H. R. 11094, providing for the erection of a new building, it is estimated that a building of four stories and basement, with a ground area of 8,000 square feet, will meet the requirements of the service at Macon. A building of the dimensions indicated, of fireproof construction, including heating apparatus, fireproof vaults, and approaches, can be constructed for \$275,000, exclusive of additional land. In order to erect a new building on the present site it will be necessary to secure additional land, which it is estimated can be secured for \$25,000. You are further advised that it is estimated that an entirely new site can be secured for \$25,000.

Respectfully,

H. A. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
House of Representatives.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 25, 1902.

SIR: Under date of February 28, 1902, this Department had the honor, in compliance with your request, to submit for your consideration a report

and estimate in connection with H. R. 10590, providing for the acquisition of additional land and the construction of an addition to the public building at Macon, Ga., and H. R. 11094, providing for the erection of a new public building on the present site or upon a new site.

An item of \$58,000 was provided by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1899, for the extension and enlargement of the present Federal building at Macon, Ga., and for the purchase of additional land for the site thereof, and in submitting the report above referred to this Department's estimates were based upon such an enlargement of the building as was contemplated at the time said appropriation was made, and included only sufficient money to cover the increased cost of building materials.

The Department has more carefully considered the matter of the proposed enlargement of said building, and in view of the rapid growth of the city and the increase in the volume of the Federal business which is transacted in said building, it is found that \$125,000 will be required for additional land and for the erection of a suitable extension, including the necessary changes in the present building, which will necessitate an appropriation, in addition to the \$58,000 heretofore provided, of \$67,000.

Respectfully,

L. M. SHAW,
Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
House of Representatives.

Mr. BARTLETT. As I understand it, that recommendation was for \$125,000, whereas this bill carries only \$72,000. That is the difference.

Mr. MERCER. Yes; the recommendation of the Treasury Department is that the total authorization should be \$125,000. It seems that in the Fifty-fifth Congress legislation was had appropriating \$58,000 for this purpose, and, owing to the rise of building material and the increase of expense in other ways connected with building material, the Treasurer was unable to execute the legislation authorized in the Fifty-fifth Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT. And they have not spent a dollar of that money, owing to the fact that it is absolutely insufficient.

Mr. MERCER. So I understand; and the Treasury Department sent an estimate to the committee, making certain recommendations supplemental to a former recommendation, after this bill had been introduced, too late for this item to be changed, providing that the total authorization should be \$125,000, rather than \$72,000, meaning an increase in this bill of authorization of \$53,000.

Mr. Chairman, as no one else upon the floor has signified a desire to occupy the time, I ask unanimous consent that the committee do now rise, as if it had consumed the full three hours allotted for discussion upon this bill, and report the same back with a recommendation that the bill pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with a favorable recommendation, notwithstanding that the three hours of general debate has not yet elapsed, and as though it had elapsed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GROSVENOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14018) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with a recommendation that it do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the bill has never been read in the committee or in the House, and I think it ought to be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please restate his point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The bill has not been read in the committee or in the House, and I submit the bill ought to be read.

The SPEAKER. The bill has been partially read in committee, and unanimous consent has been given by the committee to report the same back.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. To dispense with the first reading in the committee?

The SPEAKER. That was in the report.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. No, sir; the committee dispensed with the first reading of the bill in committee by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can demand the third reading of the bill, if he desires, after the bill has been engrossed and ordered to a third reading.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I do not demand the reading of the engrossed copy at all, but I simply make the point that the bill itself ought to be once read, for mere form, at any rate, before it is passed.

The SPEAKER. That has been dispensed with by unanimous consent given by the committee. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The third reading of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I did not hear the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overruled the point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Then the bill is to be passed without any reading at all?

The SPEAKER. The reading of the bill can be demanded in full now if the gentleman desires.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I submit it is very unusual—

The SPEAKER. But the committee gives unanimous consent for the course pursued, and the order itself—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Unanimous consent was given to dispense with the first reading of the bill in the committee, which is usual, but there has not been any consent given to dispense with the reading of the bill at all.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. We have all read the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I have never seen a bill of this magnitude passed without it once being read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. The Clerk will read the first ruling found on page 647 of the Manual.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill which has been read in Committee of the Whole and reported favorably therefrom is not read in full again when acted upon by the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That is all right, but the bill has not been read in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman knows very well as a parliamentary—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. But, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend a moment? The gentleman knows very well that the Chair has to assume that the bill has been read, and it comes here by unanimous consent.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I have not made myself understood to the Chair, with all due respect, I think. When we go into Committee of the Whole on the bill, the first motion usually is—or the first request—to dispense with the first reading of the bill; otherwise it would be read in full. Now, that was done. Then in Committee of the Whole it is usual to read the bill under the five-minute rule, and after that, the bill having been read in committee, the rule applies that it is not necessary that the bill should be again read, because it has been read under the five-minute rule in Committee of the Whole. But, Mr. Speaker, that has not been done—

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, there are two answers—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I am not making a captious objection. It is unusual—

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is unusual to pass a bill of this magnitude without reading it in the House of Representatives or in committee. Now, it has not been read in either place, and the unanimous consent that was given in Committee of the Whole was that which is usually given to dispense with the first reading, because there always follows a reading of the bill under the five-minute rule. But that was not done because of the special rule. Now we are called upon to pass a bill carrying this amount that never has been read in the House nor in committee.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, there are two answers to the point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The first is that the time for him to have made this point of order, if it was available, was before the committee rose and reported the bill back to the House. Then a point of order could have been made that it was not in order for the committee to rise and report the bill back, because it had not been read under the five-minute rule. That objection, however, would have been met by the order itself, which cut off the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule, and which binds the House to the action of the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. There is not the slightest difficulty about the situation, as the Chair views it. The Chair is bound to assume that every necessary step has been taken in the Committee of the Whole, including the reading of the bill. The gentleman from Tennessee knows very well that the reading under the five-minute rule is not one of the readings referred to in the rule, but is merely a matter of convenience for the members in case they wish to offer amendments. The rule adopted by the House makes that unnecessary, and the bill comes to the House with every presumption in favor of all having been done that is required to be done by the rules of the House of Representatives, and the House has passed the bill to its engrossment and third reading.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. If I may be heard—

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman now desires to have the bill read in full, the Chair sees no objection to ordering it to be done. The rule requires it to be done if the demand is made. Otherwise, it will be done by its title.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Of course I could demand

the reading of the engrossed copy, but I have no desire or inclination to take the time to do that. I would have that right under the rule unquestionably to have the engrossed bill read, but I say I am not making a captious objection. My objection was one that, I think, went to the merits of the proposition, and that is, that the bill should have been once read, either in Committee of the Whole or in the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair assumes that that was done if it was necessary. The Chair does not have the record of the committee before him. The question is on the third reading of the bill, which, in the absence of a demand for the reading of the engrossed bill in full, will be by title.

The bill was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question being taken on the passage of the bill, the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused, 9 members (not a sufficient number) rising in support of the demand therefor.

Accordingly the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. MERCER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SECOND CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN STATES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President; which, with the accompanying documents, was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State, submitting the report, with accompanying papers, of the delegates of the United States to the second conference of American States held at the City of Mexico from October 22, 1901, to January 22, 1902.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, April 29, 1902.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. WADSWORTH, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13895) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, with Mr. POWERS of Maine in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the bill H. R. 13895, the Agricultural appropriation bill. The pending question is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, which the Clerk will now report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 6, page 24, after the word "direct," insert:

"Provided, That the relative proportion of vegetable, flower, and other seeds allotted to any district shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with the written request of the Senator, Representative, or Delegate entitled to the same, filed with him at least sixty days prior to the time of advertisement for the purchase of such seeds: *Provided, however*, That the total cost of the seeds furnished under such written request shall not exceed the cost of the seeds that would otherwise be allotted to such Senator, Representative, or Delegate in Congress; nor shall the allotment of flower seeds of any other district be thereby curtailed."

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one which several years ago passed this House, but was rejected in the Senate. The amendment was also offered in the last Congress on this appropriation bill, but, as I remember it, it went out on a point of order. I understand that no point of order has been raised against it on this bill. It is a proper amendment. If seed distribution at the expense of the Government is to be continued, there ought to be some judgment and reason in the manner of the distribution. It is perfectly absurd, as gentlemen will concede, no doubt, that a great lot of agricultural seeds, vegetable and farming seeds, shall be sent to members representing city districts.

On the other hand, the number of flower-seed packages that are given to those representing the city and suburban districts is out of all proportion to the demands of their districts. If this appropriation is to be continued, it ought to be so arranged that the members who represent farming districts can have farming seeds—in other words, vegetable and garden seeds—while those who represent city and suburban districts should be excused from the distribution of garden and vegetable seeds, and should be given flower seeds. The object of this amendment is to permit the Secretary of Agriculture, upon the request of Members and Senators, to make such selection of seeds as will meet the needs of their individual districts. Now, I understand that the Secretary of Agriculture—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do I understand that the gentleman's amendment excludes the country people from having flower seed?

Mr. BROMWELL. No; it does not cut any member off from getting his full quota of flower seeds as he does now. The only thing it does is to permit the city member to obtain flower seeds instead of vegetable seeds.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why not give him flower seeds as a right and not give him any garden seed at all?

Mr. BROMWELL. The probability is that the city member would not want any vegetable seeds.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is just exactly what I am saying.

Mr. BROMWELL. If this amendment is agreed to the city member will be able to get flower seeds.

Mr. WACHTER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BROMWELL. Certainly.

Mr. WACHTER. Would that be at the option of the city member?

Mr. BROMWELL. That will be at the option of the city member.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I would suggest to the gentleman that I assume that the Secretary of Agriculture has the right and has the power conferred in this amendment, and it is therefore superfluous.

Mr. BROMWELL. I do not know whether he has the power or not.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. He is willing to do this.

Mr. BROMWELL. But I do know the fact that in the past the Secretary of Agriculture has felt constrained to give each member the same number of vegetable seeds and flower seeds.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. But I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts, who offered this amendment, has a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture proposing to do just what this amendment does.

Mr. BROMWELL. I was going to add, if the gentleman had not made that statement, that I also have had a statement from the gentleman in charge of the seed division of the Agricultural Department, in which he said that arrangements will hereafter be made by which a member can express his preference and get the seeds from the Department possibly without the legislation in this bill, and secure the variety of seeds that he desires.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman—and it may be the last opportunity that I will have—that the present Secretary of Agriculture, it seems to me, has grown with the needs of the service of his Department, and is to-day perhaps the best-qualified man in the country for the position which he holds. The change which has been made since he has taken hold of this work of the Agricultural Department has been in the interest of agriculture in this country, and I believe that as we are so often criticising those departments, when an opportunity comes to pay a little tribute of praise for efficient and valuable service we ought not to hesitate to render it. [Applause.]

Seed distribution is a thing which I have opposed, I think consistently, ever since I have been a member of Congress. I did not believe in it, and I do not believe in it to-day; and yet there is no question at all but what the farmers, and, for that matter, the city people, are all as anxious to get their quota of flower and vegetable seeds as they are to get their share of publications that are issued from the different departments; and therefore, recognizing that this distribution will probably continue, I hope that whenever an opportunity comes for improving the service in this regard that the House will not hesitate to adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has for its object just what an amendment had which was offered at the last session of Congress. I objected to the amendment at that time, for reasons which do not exist upon the face of the present amendment. The amendment now is in such shape that I think there can be no legitimate objection to it on the part of members who represent the country districts, because the amendment itself provides that such members as designate flower seed instead of vegetable seed shall not be permitted to get a larger money value of seeds than the country members get, or which they themselves otherwise would get.

The amendment furthermore provides that the number or amount of flower seeds gotten by other members shall not be curtailed because of the selection of flower seeds instead of vegetable seeds by other members. I merely want to say that I see no objection to the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, since introducing the amendment under discussion, I have received a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he states that if this amendment is adopted and becomes a law, he feels that it will seriously interfere with the securing of proper seeds, for the reason that some of these contracts have to be made one and two years in advance.

The Secretary also states in his letter, which I shall later send to the desk and ask to have read, that arrangements have been made, and will be hereafter made, to provide city members with such amount of flower seeds as their districts will require, and that hereafter there will be no trouble whatever on the part of city members. I ask that this letter be read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the letter be read in his time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1902.

MY DEAR SIR: I notice from the proceedings in the House yesterday that you introduced an amendment providing that the relative proportion of vegetable, flower, and other seeds allotted to any district shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the written request of the Senator, Representative, or Delegate entitled to the same, filed with him at least sixty days prior to the time of the advertisement for the purchase of such seeds.

Evidently the object of this amendment is to give city members flower seeds and country members vegetable seeds, if they so desire. Owing to the enormous quantity of seed which now has to be purchased I feel certain that any clause of this kind would seriously interfere with securing proper seed, as it now happens that quite a number of our contracts for seed have to be made at least a year and sometimes two years in advance. All contracts for seed for next year have already been made; in fact, they had to be made in order to secure the seed at all, as it would not have been practicable to await the enactment of the bill by Congress.

Of course, the contracts are subject to appropriations made by Congress. As a matter of fact, however, this very point that you make has been considered fully this year by the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, who is in charge of this work. Arrangements have been made to furnish city members flower seed if they so elect, so that I am sure there will be no difficulty in securing flower seed in the future for city constituencies. The quantity of flower seed given to each member has also been increased and other improvements in the seed distribution made, which will bring it back to its original intent.

In view of these facts I trust that you will not find it necessary to push the amendment you have introduced.

Very truly, yours,

JAMES WILSON,
Secretary.

HON. E. W. ROBERTS,
House of Representatives.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of impeding or embarrassing the Department of Agriculture when I offered the amendment yesterday. In view of the statement of the Secretary that the amendment, if adopted, might embarrass the Department, in view of his further statement that arrangements have been made whereby city members will secure flower seeds the same as if the amendment had been adopted, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "indicated," in line 6, page 25, the following: "And upon request to the Secretary by a Representative or Delegate there shall be placed in each envelope or wrapper such number of small packages of seeds of his quota as he may designate."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is this: At the present time five small packages are placed in an envelope or wrapper and that wrapper is subject to one frank. Now, some of us desire to send more than one of these wrappers or envelopes to a constituent. For instance, I have been sending this session of Congress four to each constituent to whom I send seeds at all. It causes the necessity of directing four different packages, whereas simply upon request made to the Secretary the four packages could be inclosed in the one wrapper, and that would obviate the difficulty and save an immense amount of labor. In other words, in my case it would save three-quarters of the time in directing seeds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think that might encourage other constituents to send for the same amount of seeds and thus embarrass the member?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I do not think they understand how many packages are placed in a wrapper. They do not know anything about the distribution of the seeds. A great many envelopes that are directed to me are directed in care of the Agricultural Department. You will find that this will save an immense amount of labor in the direction of packages of seeds. In cases where you want to send two it would save one-half, and when you want to send three it will save two-thirds. It seems to me, in view of that fact, and that it is no more trouble to the Department, that this amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a suggestion that to my mind is a much better way to get around the difficulty the gentleman speaks of. I have suggested this to Mr. Galloway, of the Agricultural Department, and I think the plan will be adopted. All of us have calls for special kinds of seeds, and the party writes the names of the seed he wants. The seed packages are put up at present and sealed, having five small packages of seed with the name stamped thereon on the outside of the wrapper. When the member gets the request from his constituent it becomes necessary frequently to tear open a great number of these packages and take out the seed packages and rewrap them and mail them.

I have suggested to Mr. Galloway that if a certain proportion

of each member's quota could be furnished to him in bulk, with the "outside wrapper unsealed, so that he could take the inside packages of seeds and select those called for and put as many as he chooses in the outside wrapper and seal it and mail it, it would be a great convenience for the members and it would accomplish the very purpose to which the gentleman from Colorado speaks. At the same time it would prevent a great deal of waste of inside packages by reason of the fact that frequently a party will ask for one or two of the kinds of seeds inclosed and would not want the other three. According to the plan I have suggested the member can select the two he wants and retain the three to send to some other constituent.

Mr. SHAFROTH. What did Mr. Galloway say?

Mr. BROMWELL. He said he thought there was no doubt that my suggestion could be complied with.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have no doubt that would be an improvement on the present condition, but at the same time it does not quite meet the condition that arises in my case, where I send all the seeds that are in two or three packages to one constituent. Each one of those packages under the present system must be addressed, but if this amendment be adopted all we have to do is to put the 10 small packages into 1 envelope, so that in directing there will be only half as much work as in directing 2 envelopes each containing 5 packages. There would thus be considerable saving of labor. Under the present system, if you want to send a constituent 15 small packages, you have to write 3 addresses.

Mr. BROMWELL. Oh, no; not under the plan I propose. I would take the entire 15 and put them in one wrapper.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not receive one request out of a hundred asking for any particular kind of flower seed or vegetable seed; consequently I send the writers the regular allotment.

Mr. BROMWELL. Nine-tenths of those sending requests to me specify the seeds that they want.

Mr. SHAFROTH. As to nine-tenths of the applications sent to me there is no request, but simply the names. Now, if the seeds are put in such packages as I propose, one-half or three-fourths of the labor in directing the packages to constituents is saved.

Mr. VANDIVER. Does not my friend think that the work of reassorting would increase the labor much more than would be saved by his plan?

Mr. SHAFROTH. My plan does not involve reassorting at all.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, the suggestion of my colleague [Mr. BROMWELL] does not go far enough to meet the emergency of this occasion. In order that we may become adept and competent distributors of garden seed under that system, the Government ought to furnish a convenient number of tin cans, about the size, perhaps, of tubs, with the proper label upon each and a little tin scoop with each one, so that the member of Congress, in his leisure hours—having nothing else to do—may, aided by his clerk, to read the prescription of the constituent [laughter], shovel the contents properly into the little bags, and send them off.

I am content to do the best I can to distribute the garden seeds that come to me. I take great pains to send the flower seeds that come in my quota to those that I think will appreciate them. As a rule, they are sent to the daughters of farmers or to persons residing in the little hamlets of my district, not to the cities, where the people have hothouses and other facilities for promoting the development of the flora of the country.

Now, I am willing to do all that; but I draw the line on the subject of packing garden seeds into parcels to suit the demands of my constituents. More than one-half of the letters I get start out with a catalogue of the seeds that the writer wants. If such an amendment as now suggested should be put upon this bill, I should be obliged to have a number of cans or tubs, or whatever they might be, larger than any room I can afford to pay for at my hotel.

Mr. VANDIVER. Does not the gentleman from Ohio think that if this business of distributing seeds is to go on in competition with all the corner groceries of the country, so as to supply all the various kinds of seeds to each person who may desire them, it will become advisable and necessary that we furnish members with additional clerks and furnish the Agricultural Department with an additional supply of money—enough to buy seeds for all the people throughout the whole country? I do not see where the limit is to be fixed if we keep on with this business.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I know where I would fix the limit. I would not make the matter any worse than it is now.

Mr. WANGER. The gentleman says he does not want this matter to become "worse." Does he regard it as being bad now?

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is somewhat of a burden, but I am willing to bear my share of "the white man's burden" and the black man's burden, so far as the matter has now extended; but I am not willing, if I can help myself, to go into the business of packing assorted garden seeds into the appropriate parcels.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant

to oppose anything offered by my friend from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], but I think that this amendment ought not to pass. It would save very little labor to members of the House. Already they are furnished with slips. After this their franks will be printed upon the slips. It is very little trouble to direct three slips instead of one, or two instead of one; and although the plan suggested might save a little labor to the member, it would put much more labor on the Agricultural Department, because then the Department, instead of dealing with a uniform package, would have to deal with a large number of packages of various sizes, in accordance with the whims of members or their constituents. I do not think we ought to undertake to save a small amount of labor to ourselves at the expense of putting a great deal of labor upon the Department.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There is another reason, it seems to me, why this amendment should be adopted. It is not only a saving to the members but it is also a saving in the handling of these packages through the Post-Office Department. Each particular package causes as much trouble to be handled, if it is small or double the size, and consequently there will be some saving in that line, but the Department will not be put to much trouble because of the fact that there is not more than one member out of four who will want his seed in different size packages than the regular size of five small packages in a wrapper, and to those who do want them, and particularly to those who have some city constituents, it seems to me that there would be a great saving in the distribution of these packages of seeds if 20 small packages or 10 small packages could be sent in one envelope to one address instead of by two or three or four addresses.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that if the members will go to Dr. Galloway, I have not the least doubt but he will comply with any reasonable request. Such an amendment as this is entirely unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, before the question is taken I ask that the amendment be again read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the amendment be again read. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Investigating production of domestic sugar: For all expenses, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington or elsewhere, necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue inquiry and ascertain the progress made in the production of domestic sugar from beets and sorghum, including the area of available lands thereto by irrigation or otherwise, and to investigate all other matters concerning the same, \$5,000: *Provided*, That all appropriations herein or hereafter made for the benefit of the Bureau of Plant Industry, and to be expended under the general direction of the Chief of that Bureau, shall be considered interchangeable, and may be used for the work of any of the several branches and offices thereof as the necessities of the service may, in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, demand; and the clerks, laborers, and others appointed to or employed in any particular office or branch of that Bureau may be detailed to perform service in any other office or branch thereof.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me make an amendment first.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman makes his amendment it will be too late for me to make my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. CANNON. I make the point of order upon all of the proviso from line 10 to line 20, inclusive, commencing with the word "Provided," and particularly do I make the point of order upon the word "hereafter," in line 11, page 26. I call the attention of the Chair and of the committee as well to the fact that this changes existing law. They are not content with putting in this general consolidation provision in this bill, but they change the law and say that hereafter all appropriations in detail, every dollar of it, seeds and everything else—hearken, my fellow-statesmen [laughter]—by means of this provision (I was going to say surreptitious provision), artfully couched in these words, this dominating committee proposes to make available every dollar that is appropriated for our seeds to employ clerks with. [Laughter.]

Now, is that to be submitted to for a holy minute? That is just what it does. Six hundred and one thousand seven hundred and eighty dollars in amount, commencing on page 14, Bureau of Plant Industry, covering every page up to and including 26, covering all appropriations for seeds and everything else by this surreptitious proviso, is all lumped, in the discretion of the Secretary, now and hereafter, into one sum, and made available for the appointment of clerks or laborers or employees. We can not stand it, and in the interests of the horny-handed sons of toil in this House [laughter], and I am one of them, I rise and invoke the point of order upon this whole provision.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is undoubtedly well taken, and I will say further that I was on my feet to ask that that proviso be stricken out. We put it in the bill, I think, under misapprehension. It is undoubtedly not good legislation, and I hope the committee will strike it out, but not on a point of order, but on its merits.

Mr. CANNON. Now, just a word in reply. I am still not content. I know I could not overthrow my genial friend from Connecticut [Mr. HENRY] and other gentlemen alone, and as long as this is written in the bill and in the name of the farmer, I am afraid my friend from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and myself together could not knock this out, bad as it is, and therefore I must adhere to my point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, the end justifies the means. It is immaterial which way it goes out. If it goes out on a point of order, I am content, although I would rather have it put out on its merits. The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. One moment, before the Clerk reads. I offer the following amendment:

In line 8, after the word "lands," insert the word "adapted."

It is a mere clerical amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the bill will be so amended.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Plant Industry, \$901,780.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 22, page 26, the following:

"That it shall be unlawful for any transportation company, after July 1, 1902, to offer for entry at any port in the United States, any trees, plants, shrubs, vines, grafts, cuttings, and buds, commonly known as nursery stock, unless accompanied by a certificate of inspection by a qualified expert of the country from which the exportation was made, officially appointed by the government thereof, certifying that the contents have been carefully examined and found apparently free from all insect and fungous or other disease dangerously injurious to nursery stock.

"In case any nursery goods are offered for entry at any port of the United States without said certificate, as herein prescribed, it shall be the duty of the collector immediately to notify the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall arrange for inspection to be made at the expense of the importer, who shall pay therefor a fee to be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and said collector shall not allow them to pass within the jurisdiction of the United States until a satisfactory certificate of inspection has been received. And after the aforesaid date, July 1, 1902, all nursery stock imported in accordance with the aforesaid regulations shall be free from all further inspection, quarantine, or restriction in interstate commerce: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, order specific examinations, and may also, at any time, relieve such articles from inspection by a specific order.

"SEC. 2. That whenever it shall appear to the Secretary of Agriculture that any nursery stock or variety of fruit grown in an infested district outside of the United States is being, or is about to be, imported into the United States, and such nursery stock or variety of fruit is infested by any seriously injurious insect or disease, which insect or disease is liable to become established in the United States and seriously affect any such nursery stock or variety of fruit grown therein, he shall have authority to quarantine against any such importations and prevent the same until such time as it may appear to him that any such insect or disease has become exterminated in the country or district from which such fruit or nursery stock is being, or is about to be, imported, when he may withdraw the quarantine, and this shall operate to relieve all such nursery stock or fruit from such further quarantine or restriction as is provided for in this section so long as the conditions of freedom from seriously injurious insects or disease shall continue.

"SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture may designate, in each State and Territory and in the District of Columbia, qualified experts, with authority to examine all nursery stock about to be transported from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia into another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, and issue their certificate stating the results of such examinations.

"The Secretary may publish rules and regulations prescribing the terms and conditions under which such experts may act. These examinations shall be made, so far as possible, between June 1 and September 1 of each year, in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture; and if such nursery stock is found to be apparently free from dangerously injurious insects or diseases, the certificate of the authorized expert making such examination and finding shall be issued to the owner or owners of such nursery stock, a copy of which certificate shall be attached to and accompany each carload, box, bale, or package, and when so attached and accompanying shall operate to release all such nursery stock from further inspection, quarantine, or restriction in interstate commerce.

"SEC. 4. That it shall be unlawful for any person, persons, or corporation to deliver to any other person, persons, or corporation, or to the postal service of the United States (except for scientific purposes by permission of the Secretary of Agriculture), for transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or for exportation to any foreign country, any trees, plants, shrubs, vines, or other nursery stock which have not been examined in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of this act, or which, on said examination, have been declared by the inspector to be infested with dangerously injurious insects or diseases. Any person, persons, firm, or corporation who shall forge, counterfeit, or knowingly alter, deface, or destroy any certificate or copy thereof, as provided for in this act and in the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, or shall in any way violate the provisions of this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on a conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not to exceed \$500 nor less than \$200, or by imprisonment not to exceed one year, or both, at the discretion of the court.

"SEC. 5. That the rules and regulations herein provided for shall be promulgated on or before the 1st day of July in each year.

"SEC. 6. That the sum of \$50,000, to be available on the 1st day of May, 1902, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 7. That this act shall take effect on and after the 30th day of June, 1902.

"SEC. 8. That the provisions of this act shall not apply in interstate commerce to florists' greenhouse trees, shrubs, plants, and bulbs, commonly known as florists' stock."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I must certainly reserve the point of order on this amendment until I can look a little further. On a hasty reading of it I think I shall have to make the point of order that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Well, if there is any necessity for it, although my friend requests me for a moment to reserve the point of order, I certainly have no objection to doing that.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offered this amendment, which is the same as House bill 10999, to provide rules and regulations governing the importation of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, grafts, cuttings, and buds, commonly known as nursery stock, and fruits into the United States, and rules and regulations for the inspection of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, grafts, cuttings, and buds, commonly known as nursery stock, grown within the United States, which become subjects of interstate commerce or exportation. This bill has been before Congress for a number of years.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Three years.

Mr. HAUGEN. The bill was submitted to the nurserymen of this country, to the Agricultural Department, and the scientific men in the Department before it was introduced in this Congress, and as far as I know it meets with the approval of all concerned. The legislation is very much desired by all parts of the country, especially, I think, by the people of California.

I have been in correspondence with a number of people from different parts of the country, California and New York more especially, and so far as I know this legislation is much desired by all interested in this business. I hope that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will not raise the point of order. I should like to have the Clerk read the report that accompanies the bill, for the information of the committee, before the point of order is ruled upon.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask that it be read in his time?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the report which he sends to the Clerk's desk be read in his time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk began the reading of the report.

The CHAIRMAN (during the reading). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the report which the Clerk has been reading be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10999) to provide rules and regulations governing the importation of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, grafts, cuttings, and buds, commonly known as nursery stock and fruits, into the United States, and rules and regulations for the inspection of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, grafts, cuttings, and buds, commonly known as nursery stock, grown within the United States, which become subjects of interstate commerce or exportation, report the same to the House with the unanimous recommendation that it do pass.

The necessity of such legislation is of grave importance for the protection of our agricultural and horticultural interests. Scientific men and nurserymen have recommended it for years, and the demand for it upon the part of the people has become so strong that it should be deferred no longer. The pending bill has been indorsed by representatives of entomologists and vegetable pathologists, as well as by nurserymen and fruit growers. The committee is not advised of any opposition to this bill from any quarter.

It is an acknowledged fact that fully one-half of the principal injurious insects now in the United States have been introduced from foreign countries. No effort on the part of the General Government has ever been made to inhibit the entrance of such pests.

The State of California has alone established a horticultural quarantine at the port of San Francisco, but this is the only one of our great ports which is so protected. At San Francisco during the past year 122 steamships and sailing vessels arrived carrying trees, plants, and fruits from Japan, Ceylon, Australia, New Zealand, South Sea Islands, Central America, Mexico, and British Columbia. The quarantine officer destroyed over 3,000 trees and plants infested with insects new to California. Other stock was thoroughly fumigated with hydrocyanic acid gas.

The estimated annual damage to agricultural and horticultural interests of this country from the attacks of injurious insects amounts to \$300,000,000; and it is safe to say that, at a low estimate, at least one-half of this damage is done by imported insects.

As indicated in a later paragraph, a number of foreign countries have quarantined against American plants and fruits, but no such quarantine exists in this country, although the necessity of it, from the facts just mentioned, is obvious.

There exists in Europe, especially in south Europe, and in the countries beyond the Pacific, with which we are just entering into greatly enlarged commercial relations, many insects noted as pests which are liable at any time to make their appearance in this country under existing conditions.

It has been so general an experience as to make it practically a hard-and-fast rule that foreign insects introduced into this country thrive in a much greater degree than in their own native homes.

From the West Indies and from Mexico we are also in danger. For example, there exists in Mexico a maggot which infests oranges and lemons, known as Morelos fruit worm, which has not yet become established in this country. It occurs in all parts of Mexico and Central America, except possibly the State of Sonora in Mexico, and Mexican oranges for the United States have come across our borders and taken their place in our markets during the months of November and December. Most of these oranges have previously been shipped to Northern markets, where there is no danger of an orange pest establishing itself. Of late, however, they have been carried into California, and the extensive citrus industry of that State is in danger. Within the past two months a cargo of Mexican oranges, riddled with this maggot, was stopped at the port of San Francisco, and the oranges were burned under the operation of the State quarantine law.

Louisiana and Florida are not protected in the same way, however, and the danger is a real one. Even in the case of the Mexican oranges shipped to the Northern and Middle States, the empty cars are frequently carried back to California, and perhaps to other orange-growing regions, and thus becoming an additional source of danger.

The success of the State quarantine at the port of San Francisco indicates what may be done and what should be done at other ports of entry of the country by national legislation. It should be said, however, that while the quarantine at San Francisco protects California, it does not protect the rest of the country, because the State officers have jurisdiction over shipments intended for California.

It is safe to say that had such a quarantine service been in operation at all the principal ports of the United States during the past thirty years, the cost of its operation would have compared with the actual saving to the agricultural and horticultural interests of this country as 1 to 100, and it is equally safe to say that such a service in the future would result with equal, and probably, on account of the increased foreign trade, with greater relative benefit to this country.

A seriously destructive insect known as the San Jose scale, introduced a number of years ago into California, possibly from Japan, has been and is being scattered over our country in interstate commerce.

This scale is the worst insect enemy to orchard trees which this country has ever known. Since its accidental introduction into the Eastern States it has spread or has been carried into almost every State in which the orchard industry is a feature. It has done its greatest damage in the States of Maryland, Virginia, New Jersey, Ohio, Georgia, Indiana, and Illinois. It also occurs in Canada, and has been the cause of an absolute prohibition against the introduction of American trees and plants on the part of Canada, Germany, Austria-Hungary, France, Switzerland, Turkey, and Cape Colony, and of fruits as well on the part of Germany.

The worst aspect of this danger is that the insect itself is so extremely minute that it is carried in shipments of trees and plants, and obtains a foothold in many places, and entirely escapes the attention of the untrained eye until after it may have done irreparable damage and become thoroughly established and escaped from this as a center of destruction to the regions round about.

In spite of its minute size, it multiplies with such rapidity as to cover the bark of young trees and sap their vitality to such an extent that the trees are killed in the course of two or three years.

For example, in Maryland a peach orchard of 20,000 trees was completely destroyed in two years.

An outbreak occurred on Catawba Island, Ohio, which necessitated the destruction of over 3,000 bearing peach trees and the expensive treatment of an additional area of 1,000 acres.

The peach and plum interests of Georgia are very great. In one county alone the orchards are estimated to be worth over \$5,000,000. In certain portions of the State the trees have become infested by the scale to such an extent that within the past few weeks one orchard of 3,000 trees has been condemned and the trees burned. In another orchard 1,000 trees have been condemned and burned the present winter. Thus the orchard interests of this State are threatened, perhaps, with extinction.

In North Carolina a valuable orchard of 60,000 large peach trees was cut down, and the trees were burned the past autumn.

Instances similar to these might be multiplied.

The danger from this insect is greater in this country than in any other country on account of the custom among nurserymen and orchardists of very extended interstate commerce. Nursery stock is bought in small and large quantities in different States and is shipped by freight, express, or by mail to other States, thus spreading the infestation.

The chief danger to the nursery interests of the country is that the different States have passed diverse laws, many of them very drastic in character, practically prohibitory, so that an honest nurseryman is unable to send clean nursery stock into many of the States, while a dishonest man, or a careless one, may freely send infested stock to other States which have not yet protected themselves by State laws. These difficulties can only be reached by a law governing interstate commerce, such as is now proposed.

Moreover, aside from the actual damage which the insect has done in nurseries, the fact becoming known that a nursery has become infested with a scale has, in many cases, operated so severely as to entirely destroy the reputation and credit of the firm.

A single extensive nursery located in the Middle West was forced into bankruptcy on account of having become infested by this pest, which not only necessitated the destruction of many thousand trees, but practically put a stop to further sales of noninfested stock. A loss of \$100,000 was thus entailed.

From what has just been said the necessity for a uniform national law becomes apparent. The different requirements of State laws and the entire lack of any law in certain States has produced a condition intolerable to the nurseryman and of great danger to the orchardist.

For example, a man shipping trees into Maryland requires one form of certificate; shipping into Virginia he requires yet another form under present regulations; while into other States, as Ohio, no form of certificate is required, thus making it the dumping ground for infested stock from all districts.

Moreover, in New York the law prohibits sending infested stock outside the State, but does not prohibit its entrance.

Such incongruities as these in State laws indicate most strongly the necessity for a uniform national law.

In the opinion of the committee this bill is a step in the right direction, and is worthy of early and favorable consideration.

The Department of Agriculture has for some time been collecting, with the assistance of the Department of State, the full texts of the regulations of those foreign governments which have, through fear of the introduction of San Jose scale, adopted measures prohibiting the importation of American plants and fruits or requiring inspection before admission. However, the series is not yet perfectly complete. The digests have been made with care.

Austria-Hungary.—Prohibits (decree of April 20, 1898) importation of America of living plants, grafts and layers, and fresh plant refuse of every kind, as well as the barrels, boxes, and other coverings in which such goods or refuse may be packed, and fresh fruit and the refuse of fresh fruit, as well as the packings which may cover the same, when examination on frontier

shall prove presence of San Jose scale. Admission limited to Bodenbach, Tetschen, Trieste, and Fiume. Also prohibits transit of such goods through the Empire.

Belgium.—Importation and transit of fresh fruits, living plants, and fresh parts of plants sent from the United States can take place only by ports of Antwerp, Ghent, and Ostende, upon production of a certificate from competent authority attesting that products are not contaminated by San Jose scale. If not accompanied by certificate, products can not be delivered until inspected, and, if not exempt, must be destroyed with packings; cost of all service at expense of importer. Order goes into effect March 15, 1899. Does not apply to shipments in direct transit by railway under supervision of customs authorities.

British Columbia.—Rules and regulations, published June 25, 1897 (under authority of "Horticultural board act, 1894"), provide that all importers of nursery stock, trees, plants, or fruit must give notice upon arrival, and before removal from wharf or station, to a member of the board or to the inspector of fruit pests, who shall inspect the same and, if clean, issue a certificate which shall be good for three months, unless revoked by further inspection. Nursery stock found to be infected shall be disinfected or destroyed. Fruit found to be infected shall be destroyed or reshipped.

Canada.—Prohibits (San Jose scale act, 18th March, 1898) importations of nursery stock from United States, Australia, Japan, and Hawaii. Stock so imported to be destroyed and importer liable to penalty prescribed by section 6 of customs tariff (\$200 for each offense).

Exempts:

1. Greenhouse plants, with the exception of roses. (Amended April 25, 1900, by striking out the words "with the exception of roses" after words "Greenhouse plants.")
2. Herbaceous perennials.
3. Herbaceous bedding plants.
4. All conifers.
5. Bulbs and tubers.

Amended (April 7, 1900) so as to authorize importations from April 7 to May 15, through customs ports of St. John, N. B.; St. Johns, Quebec; Niagara Falls and Windsor, Ontario, and Winnipeg, Manitoba, only, where they will be thoroughly fumigated with hydrocyanic acid gas.

Cape of Good Hope.—Regulations published March 25, 1896, under authority of act No. 9, dated 1876, prohibits importation of any stone-fruit tree, or any fruit, scion, cutting, graft, root, or seed, the growth or produce thereof, from the United States, and anyone importing such article as aforesaid shall be subject to a fine not exceeding £100 sterling or six months' imprisonment, and, in addition, the articles will be destroyed.

Note.—Consul-General Stowe states (February 7, 1900) that proposal is under consideration to relax above as regards States where neither "peach yellows" nor "peach rosette" exists.

France.—Prohibits (decree of November 30, 1898) entry into and passing through France of trees, shrubs, products of nurseries, cuttings, and all other plants or parts of living plants, as well as fresh debris from them, from United States, directly or in storage, as well as cases, sacks, etc., used for packing. Also prohibits fresh fruit and debris, when examination proves presence of insect at entry into France.

Germany.—Prohibits (decree of February 5, 1898) importation of living plants and parts of living plants from America, and barrels, boxes, etc., used for packing. Also fresh fruit or fresh parts of fruit when examination at port of entry shows presence of San Jose scale. Imperial chancellor authorized to grant exceptions.

Amended (commercial agreement of July 10, 1900) by annulling regulation providing that dried or evaporated fruits from United States be inspected. Such fruits now admitted without other charge than customs duties. Introduced at following points:

LIST OF PLACES AT THE BOUNDARY WHERE PLANTS MAY BE INTRODUCED.

(a) *Prussia.*—Main customs office, Eydtkuhnen; main customs office, Pillau; main tax office, Königsberg in Pr.; main customs office, Danzig; main tax office, Stettin; main customs office, Liebau; main customs office, Myslowitz; subcustoms office, 1 Oderberg; subcustoms office, 1 Ziegenhals; subcustoms office, 1 Halbstadt; subcustoms office, 1 Seidenberg; main customs office, Aachen, inclusive of the customs inspection office in the depot of Templerbend and the freight depot of Roth Erde; main customs office, Emmerich, inclusive of the two steamship-inspection offices and the customs inspection office located at that place; main customs office, Kaldenkirchen, inclusive of the customs-inspection office at the depot at that place; subcustoms office, Herbesthal; subcustoms office, Bentheim; subcustoms office, Borken; subcustoms office, Weener; main customs office Geestmünde; main customs office, Flensburg; main customs office, Hadersleben, inclusive of the subcustoms office, 1 Woyens; main customs office, Kiel; customs office at the depot in Luxemburg.

(b) *Bavaria.*—Main customs office, Lindau; main customs office, Passau; subcustoms office, Kufstein; subcustoms office, Salzburg; main customs office, Simbach, and subcustoms office, Scharding a. Th.; main customs office, Firth a. W.; subcustoms office, Eger; subcustoms office, Oberzell; subcustoms office, 1, at the depot of Eisenstein.

(c) *Kingdom of Saxony.*—Main customs office, Zittau; main customs office, Schandau; subcustoms offices, Bodenbach and Tetschen; subcustoms office, Voiteersreuth; subcustoms office, Reitzenhain; subcustoms office, 1 Warnsdorf.

(d) *Württemberg.*—Main customs office, Friedrichshafen.

(e) *Baden.*—Main customs office, Konstanz; main tax office, Singen; main tax office, Seckingen; customs offices at the depots of Schaffhausen and Waldshut; subcustoms office, Erzingen; customs office at the depot of Basel.

(f) *Oldenburg.*—Subcustoms office, 1 Nordenham.

(g) *Lübeck.*—Main custom-house, Lübeck.

(h) *Bremen.*—Port of entry, Bremen; port of entry, Bremerhaven.

(i) *Hamburg.*—Quay office, Hamburg.

(k) *Alsace-Lorraine.*—Subcustoms office, Fentsch; subcustoms office, Amanweiler; subcustoms office, Novéant; subcustoms office, Chambrey; subcustoms office, Deutsch-Avicourt; subcustoms office, Altmünsterol; subcustoms office, Basel; subcustoms office, Markkirch; subcustoms office, Saales; subcustoms office, Diedolshausen; subcustoms office, Urbis.

Netherlands.—Prohibits (decree of May 23, 1899) importation and transit, direct or indirect, of live trees and shrubs, or live parts thereof, produced in America, including boxes, casks, baskets, sacks, vessels, and other articles used for packing, unless accompanied by certificate issued by consular officer of Netherlands or competent authority in port of shipment, and objects shall not be landed unless certificate is satisfactory to receiver of import duties.

New Zealand.—Prohibits (act of 1896) importation of fruit of any kind infested with fruit flies. Fruit infested with codling moth will be destroyed unless immediately reshipped. Fruit, plants, trees, cuttings, or buds infested with any scale insect will be admitted only when accompanied by certificate. Otherwise it will be fumigated at expense of importer or destroyed.

Imported fruit admitted only at Bluff, Dunedin, Christchurch, Wellington, and Auckland.

*Exceptions: (a) Importations from countries bordering on the Netherlands in which measures have been taken for combatting the San Jose scale. (b) Importations for scientific purposes. (c) To meet requirements of frontier commerce.

Live plants admitted only at Dunedin, Christchurch, Wellington, and Auckland.

Fumigation performed only at Dunedin, Christchurch, Wellington, and Auckland.

Switzerland.—Prohibits plants; prohibits importation of fresh fruit from America, except through customs bureau at Basle, where it is subject to an examination by an expert for San Jose scale or other parasites. No restrictions to direct importation of dried fruits.

Turkey.—A note from the minister of foreign affairs to the United States minister at Constantinople, dated October 18, 1894, states that the Imperial Government has decided to interdict the importation of trees, plants, and fruits coming from the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the bill which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] proposes as an amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill simply provides for the inspection of nursery stock destined for interstate and foreign commerce. It is exactly in line with the inspection now provided for meats and lately provided, in the oleomargarine bill, for process and renovated butter. It probably is subject to a point of order, but it affords a perfect example of how difficult it is to give powers to the Secretary of Agriculture, except on the appropriation bills. This bill has been reported favorably, without a dissenting vote in the committee, three years in succession by the Committee on Agriculture. As it carries an appropriation, it goes to the Union Calendar, and there each time it has slept. I simply call attention to this fact to show you how difficult it is to give the Secretary of Agriculture any powers unless they are granted on the appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, just a word. I am diffident, when I talk in earnest, about injecting points of order that cover material matters of legislation. I have great confidence in the respective committees of this House, especially where they have studied the questions presented. So that it is not in any captious spirit, by any manner of means, that I am thinking about interposing the point of order. I have read the bill in a hop, skip, and jump, and it seems to me to be very severe in its provisions and is liable in the hands of mischievous people to give very great trouble to the citizens. Take section 3:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture may designate, in each State and Territory and in the District of Columbia, qualified experts, with authority to examine all nursery stock about to be transported from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia into another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, and issue their certificate stating the results of such examinations.

Then take section 4:

SEC. 4. That it shall be unlawful for any person, persons, or corporation to deliver to any other person, persons, or corporation, or to the postal service of the United States (except for scientific purposes by permission of the Secretary of Agriculture), for transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or for exportation to any foreign country, any trees, plants, shrubs, vines, or other nursery stock which have not been examined in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of this act, or which, on said examination, have been declared by the inspector to be infested with dangerously injurious insects or diseases.

That is, in accordance with the army of experts that would examine all the plants and trees and shrubs throughout the country, and ought to, costing God knows how much, whether one million, five million, or ten million dollars. Then here comes a penalty—a fine for violation:

Any person, persons, firm, or corporation who shall forge, counterfeit, or knowingly alter, deface, or destroy any certificate or copy thereof, as provided for in this act and in the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, or shall in any way violate the provisions of this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on a conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not to exceed \$500 nor less than \$200, or by imprisonment not to exceed one year, or both, at the discretion of the court.

Now, I am not in favor of these pests to nursery stock or trees or plants, but considering the way in which matters run, I am rather inclined to think it is absolutely my duty at this point, on a general appropriation bill, to interpose the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that in the Fifty-sixth Congress a bill somewhat similar to this was introduced in this House and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. Opposition arose to the bill and differences of opinion between the different interests in this country. When I was requested to introduce this bill in this Congress I submitted it to the different parties interested and suggested to them that they agree upon a bill, and told them that until they had agreed upon a bill that would meet the demands of the different interests involved I would absolutely refuse to take it up for consideration in my subcommittee.

This bill was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture, and the scientific men in the Department, and representative men in the nursery and horticultural business of all parts of this country, representing every State in the Union. The bill as it now stands is agreed upon by those interests. It is possible that the bill may be open to amendment, although I am inclined to believe at this time if we pass the bill we should pass it as it is drawn, and if it should be inadequate to meet the demands it could be amended or further legislation could be had later.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Not to discuss the point of order, but in line with what the gentleman has said, have you thought you were offering a bill as an amendment to the Agri-

cultural appropriation bill, a bill that has sections and has provisions peculiar to it, where that amendment prescribes certain things shall be done according to section 3? If that goes into the Agricultural appropriation bill, that will mean section 3 of the general bill. The limitation that you prescribe of expenditures of money under this act will mean the general Agricultural appropriation bill. After this bill has been adopted, if this amendment is adopted it will make it apply to the whole bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. I fully recognize that it is subject to a point of order, and if the point is raised there is no use perfecting the amendment. If the point of order is not raised, I expect to amend the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is clearly of the opinion that while this bill is similar to the oleomargarine and other bills of that nature, this is new legislation, and subject to the point of order upon an appropriation bill, and therefore sustains the point raised by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Forestry, salaries: One forester, who shall be Chief of Bureau, \$3,500; 1 assistant forester, \$2,500; 1 assistant forester, \$1,800; 1 assistant forester, \$2,000; 1 stenographer, \$1,200; 1 field assistant, \$1,500; 1 field assistant, \$1,400; 1 field assistant, \$1,200; 1 field assistant, \$1,000; 1 field assistant, \$720; 10 collaborators, at \$400 each, \$3,000; 1 clerk class 3, \$1,600; 1 photographer, \$1,200; 1 computer, \$1,000; 3 clerks class 1, \$3,600; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each, \$2,000; 4 clerks, at \$400 each, \$3,600; 7 clerks, at \$520 each, \$3,640; in all, \$37,860.

Mr. CANNON. I make the point of order on line 25, to the words "thirty-five hundred dollars," page 26.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is one of the increases recommended by the committee for scientists of the Bureau, and is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York acknowledge that it is subject to the point of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, sir. Now I ask unanimous consent to insert "\$3,000" in place of "\$3,500." That makes the salary the same as last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to make the change that he has just stated to the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk change the total in accordance with the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Forestry: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, forest reserves, forest fires, and lumbering; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to collect and distribute valuable economic forest tree seeds and plants; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in conducting experiments and investigations in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and for collating, digesting, reporting, illustrating, and printing the results of such experiments and investigations; for the purchase of all necessary supplies, apparatus, and office fixtures; for freight and express charges, and traveling and other necessary expenses, \$245,000, of which sum not to exceed \$3,000 may be used for rent, and \$700 of the latter amount may be used in payment of rent for the months of March, April, May, and June, 1902. And the employees of the Bureau of Forestry outside of the city of Washington may hereafter, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, without additional expense to the Government, be granted leaves of absence not to exceed fifteen days in any one year.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from New York would strike out the word "hereafter." I reserve the point of order. I do not want legislation on this. Let it apply to the current year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Line 15?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection to that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the word "hereafter," in line 15, will be stricken out. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Forestry, \$282,860.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may correct the total on line 20. It should be \$282,360. The gentleman from Illinois suggests that I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk correct all the totals hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Clerk correct all totals hereafter. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Chemistry, salaries: One chemist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$3,500; 1 assistant chemist, \$2,500; 1 assistant chemist, \$1,800; 1 assistant chemist, \$1,600; 1 clerk class 2, \$1,400; 2 clerks class 1, \$2,400; in all, \$13,200.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I must make the point of order on line 23, page 28, on \$3,500. I suppose the gentleman wants \$500 stricken out and let it stand at \$3,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is another scientist, Mr. Chairman,

whose salary was recommended by the committee and is subject to the point of order. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at \$3,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves to amend by striking out the words "five hundred." Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the character of proposed food preservatives and coloring matters, to determine their relation to digestion and to health, and to establish the principles which should guide their use; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the character of the chemical and physical tests which are applied to American food products in foreign countries, and to inspect before shipment, when desired by the shippers or owners of these food products, American food products intended for countries where chemical and physical tests are required before said food products are allowed to be sold in the countries mentioned, and for all necessary expenses connected with such inspection and studies of methods of analysis in foreign countries; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in collaboration with the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists, and such other experts as he may deem necessary, to establish standards of purity for food products and to determine what are regarded as adulterations therein, for the guidance of the officials of the various States and of the courts of justice; for the preparation of reports, the purchase of apparatus, chemicals, samples, and supplies required in conducting such investigations, the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in conducting such experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in collating, digesting, and reporting the results of such experiments; for freight and express charges, and for traveling and other necessary expenses, and for the rent of building occupied by the Bureau of Chemistry.

Mr. CANNON. I make the point of order on page 31, from and including the word "to," on line 1, to and including the word "justice," in line 6. The gentleman from New York asks me to reserve the point of order. I will do so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, Mr. Chairman, that clause was put in after hearings before the Committee on Agriculture of the different manufacturers of foods in various parts of the country. It seems that the different chemists of the different States differ as to what constitutes an adulteration of food, and what constitutes poisons in food that would be injurious to health and what not be injurious, and the result is that the food product in one State is declared good and wholesome and in another State declared unwholesome and impure; and the result is that the manufacturers are at sea about what to do in the matter.

They appeared before us and asked us to give the Secretary of Agriculture power to decide on inspection of said foods—what is impure food, adulterated food, or a poisonous food—and that the testimony when taken to our courts would probably regulate the matter. Our understanding is they want to have some central authority to let the State the trees have become infested by the scale. The food, to correct the pest a few weeks one orchard of 3,000 trees had another orchard 1,000 trees had. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, and we urge it, notwithstanding the point of order. It is absolutely in the line of good legislation. If we attempted to pass the bill by itself, where would it be?

Mr. CANNON. It would be subject to full and intelligent consideration upon its merits.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is subject to that now. Will the gentleman state any reason for throwing it out?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; the point of order is that it is new legislation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not talking about the point of order, but I mean on its merits.

Mr. CANNON. Let us read it and determine whether it is subject to a point of order, and, incidentally, if the committee will give me their attention, see how much merit it has.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in collaboration with the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists—

Who they are God only knows, I do not—
and such other experts as he may deem necessary—

All becoming experts in the pay of the Government. You can put in a dozen experts from every State in this Union to be constantly in session—

and such other experts as he may deem necessary—

To do what?—

to establish standards of purity for food products and to determine what are regarded as adulterations therein, for the guidance of the officials of the various States and of the courts of justice.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I suppose the gentleman from Illinois understands that Congress neither has the power, nor is it the desire by this bill, literally, to govern or control the courts of justice in the States, but to submit to them the determination of scientific men as an argument before the court, as evidence given to the courts of what constitutes adulteration, poisonous adulteration, unwholesome adulteration.

Mr. CANNON. I have great respect for the judgment of the gentleman from Mississippi, able as he is, born under conditions and living under conditions where he would be glad indeed to let the States exercise their police powers within their own jurisdiction. I think I have heard him bear testimony against paternalism in the Government—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is certainly right. If I thought this had the slightest tendency in that direction, I would be more opposed to it than is the gentleman from Illinois, but this is merely to collect and announce what, in the opinion of the chemists in the Agricultural Department, constitutes unwholesome adulteration. It controls no State, it controls no State police power; it does not pretend to; it merely gives the standard, which the State court can consider or ignore, whichever they please, but which, in our opinion, would have a persuasive force, if no other.

Mr. CANNON. And yet, under existing appropriations, the chemist of the Agricultural Department has the power to conduct these investigations. Now, then, this is legislation, as it enables the Secretary "in collaboration with the association," whatever that is, "of Official Agricultural Chemists, and such other experts as he may deem necessary;" how many? One thousand?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me to correct him?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in collaboration with the Association of the Official Agricultural Chemists and such other experts as he may deem necessary. It does not say that these other experts are to be employed; it says in collaboration with them.

Mr. CANNON. It says, "and such other experts as he may deem necessary." Why, all this appropriation for this purpose is available to pay experts.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The actual fact is this: The Association of Official Agricultural Chemists is composed of the State chemists of the various States and Territories, and it is proposed to bring them together and decide upon an agreement as to what constitutes adulterated or poisonous food.

Mr. CANNON. Does not my friend understand who pays the freight?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to make this suggestion, if the gentleman thinks there is anything in the idea that these experts are to be employed or paid by the Department. We should have no objection to inserting "not, however, to be paid by the Department of Agriculture." We do not think it is subject to that interpretation, but we have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. CANNON. It seems to me that it would be better to report the provision and let it be considered as other bills are.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This was considered after a very careful hearing. The chemists of the Department came before us, and the manufacturers and other people were heard on the question by letter and petition and in person and otherwise. I will suggest that if the gentleman will withdraw the point of order we will insert the language, after the word "necessary," "not, however, to be paid by the Department of Agriculture or by the Government of the United States," or "without expense to the Government of the United States."

Mr. CANNON. No; I will make the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am not arguing the point of order. I think the gentleman is correct in his position on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. I think so; and on the balance of the provision you are to have an army of people. I make the point of order on the whole paragraph.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think if the Chair will refer to the law under which the Agricultural Department was created he will see that the Secretary was authorized to make all the investigations in the interest of the people that was necessary, and I claim it comes under that provision of the law.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the interpretation of this language by the gentleman from Illinois is clearly not justified by anything that appears on this page. The words "in collaboration" themselves exclude the idea of employment. When two men collaborate for the production of a play or a book it is not the case that one employs the other or hires him as a servant. They work together, and the intention of this provision is to permit the chemist in the Department to work in collaboration with the chemists from the various States, from foreign countries, if that be desired and deemed necessary to arrive at the result. It seems reasonably clear that under the general legislation authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry on those investigations the provision in this section could not be ruled out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regards food products as connected with agriculture. The act creating the Department of Agriculture reads, in the first section, as follows:

There shall be at the seat of Government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

Now, while this may not be free from some doubt, yet as food

products are closely connected with agriculture "in the most comprehensive use of the word," and as this provision in the bill simply permits the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a regulation having this end in view, the Chair is inclined to believe, and will so rule, that it is not subject to the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. I bow to the decision of the Chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

To investigate, in collaboration with the Bureau of Animal Industry, the chemistry of dairy products and of adulterants used therein, and of the adulterated products; to determine the composition of process and other treated butters, and other chemical studies relating to dairy products.

To study, in collaboration with the Weather Bureau and agricultural experiment stations, the influence of environment upon the chemical composition of wheat and other cereals, with especial reference to the variation in the content of gluten, and the suitability of barley for brewing and other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. I make a point of order on the provision extending from line 16, page 31, to line 2, page 32. My point is that this is new legislation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I claim that it comes under the provision of law which the Chair has just read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois think that the provisions on which he makes the point of order differ materially from those on which the Chair has just ruled?

Mr. CANNON. I think they are clearly legislation. If the Department has the power to do this now, what is the use of putting the provision in? It is put in, no doubt, for the very purpose of giving this power to the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. This is making an appropriation to pay for doing the thing which the law authorizes the Commissioner of Agriculture to do. This case, in the view of the Chair, comes within the reasoning of the former ruling.

Mr. CANNON. Well, there is a Department of Agriculture; I cheerfully make that concession to the Chair. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and the law creating it is quite broad. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

To investigate the chemical composition of sugar-producing plants in the United States and its possessions, and, in collaboration with the Weather Bureau and agricultural experiment stations, to study the effects of environment upon the chemical composition of sugar-producing plants, especially with reference to their content of available sugar, \$20,500, \$20,000 of which sum, or so much thereof as is necessary, shall be used in investigating, determining, and reporting the proper treatment and process in order to secure uniform grade and quality of first-class marketable table cane sirup.

Mr. CANNON. I rise to a point of order, and I call the attention of the Chair to the last clause of this paragraph, providing an appropriation of \$20,000, of which so much as may be necessary "shall be used in investigating, determining, and reporting the proper treatment and process in order to secure uniform grade and quality of first-class marketable table cane sirup."

Is there anything in that except a police regulation? Of course it is not authorized by existing law. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] or anybody else thinks that he can torture the general grant coming from the mere creation of a Department of Agriculture into an authority to exercise police regulations to determine what is "first-class marketable cane sirup," I will yield to him to do so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Why, sir, the gentleman does not understand the language. I think the clause of the law, as read by the Chair, covers this point also.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] class cane sirup as an agricultural or a manufactured product? [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Ask me something easy. [Renewed laughter.] I regard it as tolerably important that we should save, if we can, \$20,000 that it is proposed to expend upon a matter of doubtful wisdom and not authorized by law—an expenditure that ought not be made except by virtue of a law fully considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Now let the Chair read to the gentleman from Illinois again what he read before; and the committee will please be in order so that the gentleman may hear.

There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, etc.

Now, it seems to the Chair that cane sugar or cane sirup may be deemed a "subject connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of the word."

Mr. CANNON. Will the Chair indulge me in a single remark? Upon the reasoning adopted by the Chair it would also be in order to make investigations from a scientific standpoint touching the propagation of the human race, because there can be no agriculture without human beings. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. That is where the Chair has the misfortune to differ with the gentleman from Illinois. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Chemistry, \$73,200.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 15, page 32, after the word "dollars," insert the following: "Provided, That all chemical work in the Department of Agriculture of every description shall be done under the direction of the Bureau of Chemistry and in collaboration with the various bureaus, divisions, and officers requiring such investigation."

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that in substance this amendment was offered by me to the committee, and it was substantially agreed to by that committee. The suggestion, however, was made at that time that it should not be pressed, because there were already chemical laboratories in other departments in operation, and that for that reason a general bill should be reported by the committee; but since that discussion I have reflected upon the proposition, and it seems to me that those things would not in any manner interfere with the enactment of this provision.

Now, what is the situation? A Bureau of Chemistry is established in the Department of Agriculture, and the inference is that that Bureau should have charge of everything of a chemical character in the way of chemical investigation that belonged to the Department of Agriculture, and the fact is that that Bureau today makes chemical analyses and does whatever is necessary in that direction for the Treasury Department, the War Department, the Department of Justice, and the Post-Office Department, and yet for the sole purpose of giving people jobs, for the sole purpose of having new bureaus and chiefs of new bureaus the chemical department in the Department of Agriculture has been duplicated five times, and three out of five of those chemical bureaus are as absolutely unnecessary and useless as it is possible for them to be.

Take, for instance, in the Bureau of Animal Industry. There has been established a bureau for the consideration of dairy products, and new apparatus, and new chemicals, and new appliances, absolute duplicates of the same department in the Bureau of Chemistry for the investigation of dairy products were installed. There are two, involving expenditure of large sums of money, and the Secretary of Agriculture admitted himself that he had no knowledge of the existence of at least one of them; it had got in there in the night—got in there without his knowledge—and that is the way these bureaus grow, and here they are. In the Department of Animal Industry there are the biochemical laboratory and the dairy products laboratory, both of them now existing in the Bureau of Chemistry proper, both of them in charge of competent men.

There is no reason in the world, the Secretary himself says, why the whole thing should not be done under the general bureau. And what next have we? Here is the Bureau of Soils, and in the general chemical bureau there is a man in charge of soil investigation, with assistants and with clerks. He does everything in the nature of soil investigation that the Department of Agriculture would like to have done or desires to have done; and yet this man at the head of the chemical department in the Bureau of Soils is not a chemist even. The chief of that bureau is not even a chemist, and yet he has a bureau there with some assistants.

Mr. CANNON. Does not my friend think it is desirable to carry on this bureau for the purpose of educating this man?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Michigan be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I will say, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, that it is my opinion that that man can not be educated either at public or private expense. [Laughter.] He was before our committee, and the conduct of the man after he went back to the Department and reported who voted in favor of the bill and who voted against the Department of Agriculture, and the discussion that he wrought up there, is an indication that he is far from being in a position to be educated. In that connection I want to call the attention of the members of the House to another thing, and I am not saying anything against him. You have been furnished with a little card from the Chief of the Bureau of Soils, advising you where he is going this summer, where he is going to survey—a card published at Government expense.

Now, those cards are sent out for a lobby, to indicate to you and to me that he is going into our territory, and he wants our support for his entire department. What other bureau is there? In the Bureau of Soils there is a chemical laboratory. What else? In the Office of Experiment Stations they do chemical work. Then,

there is another at Middletown, Conn., and another in Maine, and another at the State College in Pennsylvania. The Secretary of Agriculture said before our committee that every bit of this work ought to be done here in the city of Washington, and that it ought to be done by the Chemical Bureau at the Department of Agriculture; that the tendency of it would be to make the men in charge of the Bureau more proficient and would enable the Department of Agriculture to get better men.

And what else? In the Bureau of Plant Industry there is another chemical laboratory with appliances and material, and chiefs and assistant chiefs, and clerks, and assistants, and stenographers; and upon the proposition of consolidating these chemical bureaus the only answer that the chief of this Bureau could make, reduced to writing, and the only argument that he could make to sustain it was that it would be just as reasonable to have all the stenographers and all the typewriters under one head, and if you wanted any typewriting done or any stenographic work done that you should go to that one department of stenography.

Now, I submit, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that it is absolutely useless to have these chemical bureaus in these various departments, and that the chemistry of this Government ought to be under one controlling and proficient head, and that we ought to put a stop to this increase of bureaus and this duplication of work.

That is all I care to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HENRY] makes the point of order against the amendment, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

On motion of Mr. WADSWORTH, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. POWERS of Maine, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13895) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 5111. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Bowland;

H. R. 13031. An act to prohibit the coming into and to regulate the residence within the United States, its Territories, and all territory under its jurisdiction, and the District of Columbia, of Chinese and persons of Chinese descent; and

H. R. 5711. An act granting increase of pension to James R. Brockett.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 1321. An act to restore to the active list of the Navy the name of James G. Field;

S. 3663. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting the right to the Omaha Northern Railway Company to construct a railway across, and establish stations on, the Omaha and Winnebago Reservation, in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes," by extending the time for the construction of said railway.

S. 4339. An act authorizing the White River Railway Company to construct a bridge across the White River in Arkansas;

S. 715. An act to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; and

S. 4647. An act to amend section 4929 of the Revised Statutes, relating to design patents.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented this day to the President of the United States for his approval bill of the following title:

H. R. 13031. An act to prohibit the coming into and to regulate the residence within the United States, its Territories, and all territory under its jurisdiction, and the District of Columbia, of Chinese and persons of Chinese descent.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 1191. An act for the relief of the legal devisees of James W. Schaumburg—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3967. An act for the relief of Ramon O. Williams and Joseph A. Springer—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4419. An act to incorporate the General Education Board—to the Committee on Education.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. WOODS, until Wednesday next, on account of important business.

To Mr. STEELE, indefinitely, on account of important business. To Mr. GARDNER of Michigan, for one week, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. WADSWORTH (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an additional estimate of appropriation for the dedication of the statue of Rochambeau—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. MOODY of Oregon, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11062) to amend an act entitled "An act to make certain grants of land to the Territory of New Mexico, and for other purposes," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1828); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13174) granting an increase of pension to Ransford T. Chase, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1798); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5337) granting an increase of pension to Marietta L. Adams, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1799); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7040) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Grinnel, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1800); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8414) granting an increase of pension to George Atkinson, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1801); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13597) granting an increase of pension to Edmund B. Appleton, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1802); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8487) granting a pension to John M. Crist, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1803); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13891) granting a pension to Hiram A. Sheldon, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1804); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13377) granting a pension to Capt. Enoch Voyles, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1805); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7021) granting an increase of pension to Henry Forcht, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1806); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5321) granting a pension to Lillie May Fifield, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1807); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2787) granting a

pension to Cornelia S. Ribble, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1808); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7319) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. F. H. Anthony, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1809); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2563) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Strong, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1810); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7382) granting a pension to Jacob Mock, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1811); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1741) granting an increase of pension to Griffith Evans, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1812); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8401) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Murphy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1813); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8924) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mathews, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1814); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12562) granting an increase of pension to William H. Temple, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1815); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12047) granting an increase of pension to Jackson L. Wilson, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1816); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12779) granting an increase of pension to George Chamberlain, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1817); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13467) granting a pension to Joseph H. Woodniff, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1818); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7679) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Snyder, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1819); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4004) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Nelson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1820); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2461) granting an increase of pension to George McDowell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1821); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3992) granting an increase of pension to David M. McKnight, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1822); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Eben C. Winslow, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1823); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3999) granting an increase of pension to Emma S. Hanna, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1824); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4238) granting an increase of pension to Philo F. Englesby, reported the same

without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1825); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13480) to provide an American register for the steamer Brooklyn, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1827); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13990) for the relief of the owners of the Norwegian steamship Nicaragua, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1829); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 14080) for the appointment of a board of visitors to attend the commencement exercises at the Naval War College, at Newport, R. I.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 14081) to incorporate the Interstate Bridge Company and to authorize the construction of a railway bridge and approaches across the Ohio River, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation between the cities of Cairo, in the State of Illinois, and Paducah, in the State of Kentucky; to regulate commerce in and over such bridge between the States of Kentucky and Illinois, and to establish such bridge a military and post road—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 14082) to provide for the construction of a bridge by the Duluth, Pierre and Black Hills Railroad Company across the Missouri River at Pierre, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine (by request): A bill (H. R. 14083) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900, and to provide for a Delegate to the House of Representatives of the United States from Porto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 14084) to amend an act, "No. 76—Public," passed in the first session Fifty-sixth Congress, entitled, "An act to legalize and maintain the iron bridge across Pearl River at Rockport, Miss."—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14085) to authorize the Baltimore and Washington Transit Company to extend its street railway in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14104) to prohibit fraud in the importation of articles from the Danish Islands into the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 14105) to amend section 1754 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the preference in civil appointments of persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BULL: A resolution (H. Res. 232) requesting the Secretary of the Navy to furnish information relative to the building of war ships in the government navy-yards of foreign countries, and also to furnish the names and the cost of all vessels built by the United States during the past twenty years—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A resolution (H. Res. 233) to permit amendment of H. R. 14019, relating to assessment and collection of personal-property taxes in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 14086) to authorize the President to place the name of Archibald K. Eddowes on the retired list of the United States Navy with the rank of chief engineer, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 14087) granting a pension to Lizzie Dunlap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 14088) granting a pension to Hattie Ellsworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 14089) granting a pension to Frank Smidt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 14090) granting a pension to Henry C. Haywood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 14091) granting a pension to Charles A. Warrick—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 14092) granting an increase of pension to Silas B. Hovious—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS: A bill (H. R. 14093) granting an increase of pension to John H. Perry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14094) granting an increase of pension to James R. Richmond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A bill (H. R. 14095) granting a pension to John H. Leslie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 14096) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate George L. Fisher as second lieutenant in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 14097) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Ransom Pope and Mary Lee Pope—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 14098) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14099) granting a pension to Samantha B. Van Brocklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY: A bill (H. R. 14100) for the relief of John Mantel, of Escambia County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14101) for the relief of the estate of W. D. Williams—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 14102) to vest title to certain property in Leopold Luchs—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 14103) granting an increase of pension to Delu Norris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of 21 citizens of Missouri and other States, protesting against the "Jim Crow" car law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Thaddeus Kosciuszko Lodge, No. 309, Polish National Alliance, St. Louis, Mo., favoring House bill 16, for the erection of an equestrian statue of the late General Pulaski at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of the St. Louis Manufacturers' Association, approving the reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of St. Louis Trades and Labor Union, in favor of House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of Future Great Lodge, No. 45, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of St. Louis, Mo., in support of the bill known as "the Foraker-Corliss safety-appliance bill"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Stereotypers' Union No. 8 and Post No. 13, Grand Army of the Republic, St. Louis, Mo., favoring the construction of war vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of St. Louis Manufacturers' Association, in favor of the establishment of a department of commerce and industries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Stereotypers' Union No. 8, of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers, etc.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Shoemakers' Union No. 126, St. Louis, Mo., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Resolutions of Union No. 4, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, Topeka, Kans., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROMER: Petition of Bricklayers' Union No. 9, of Muncie, Ind., against immigration from south and east of Europe—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DOVENER: Resolutions of United Mine Workers' Unions Nos. 1875 and 1903, of Wilsonburg, W. Va., favoring the restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from the south and east of Europe—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of the Interdenominational Council of Women for Christian and Patriotic Service, New York City, for an amendment to the Constitution preventing polygamous marriages—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON: Papers to accompany House bill 726, granting a pension to Eliza Clark—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 730, for the relief of John Howell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 738, for the relief of John Morris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of H. Paul Staley and others, of Cheswick and vicinity, Allegheny County, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution preventing polygamous marriages—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of United Mine Workers' Unions of Sunnyside and Sturgeon, Pa., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Testimony in support of House bill 13798, granting an increase of pension to John H. Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANBURY: Additional papers to accompany House bill 11320, for the relief of Mary Leary and children—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL: Resolution of St. Joseph Polish Society, of South Amboy, N. J., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HULL: Resolutions of Division No. 38, Order of Railway Conductors, of Des Moines, Iowa, for the passage of House bill 9330, for a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACK: Resolutions of Chestnut Ridge Lodge, No. 310, Locomotive Firemen, of Derry Station, Pa., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the same lodge for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of D. J. Waller, jr., and others, of Indiana, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution preventing polygamous marriages—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOY: Petition of Charles Etzel, of St. Louis, Mo., for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERN: Petition of John C. Schmucker, of Bremen, Ill., favoring House bill 9206—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of St. Clair Lodge 353, of Belleville, Ill., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Bricklayers' Union No. 2, of Belleville; Carpenters' Union 798, of Salem; Butchers' Union 53; Machinists' Association No. 121, of East St. Louis; Local Union 359, of New Baden; Carpenters' Union 479, of Sparta; Cigar Makers' Union No. 410, of Centralia, and Switchmen's Union, of East St. Louis, Ill., favoring an educational test for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolutions of St. Joseph's Beneficial Society, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski, at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Petition of Harry P. Moore, of Norfolk, Va., for repeal of the duties on beef, veal, mutton, and pork—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of letter carriers of Omaha, Nebr., favoring the passage of House bill 306—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, resolution of the Omaha Real Estate Exchange, concerning irrigation—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolutions of members of the bar of Omaha, Nebr., protesting against the division of Nebraska into two judicial districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Local Lodge No. 31, Association of Machinists, Omaha, Nebr., favoring an educational test for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOON: Resolutions of Federal Labor Union, No. 7600, of Victoria, Tenn., favoring an educational test for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union No. 141, Cigar Packers' Unions Nos. 251 and 213, Carpenters' Unions Nos. 457 and 240, and Operative Plasterers' Union, all of New York City, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of citizens of Clinton, asking that the duty on beef, veal, mutton, and pork be repealed—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Trades Assembly of Utica, N. Y., in endorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Papers to accompany House bill 14077, for the relief of John L. Lynch, for loss of property by depredation of Indians—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Annie Otis Hoge, Rye, N. Y., for the repeal of the tariff on beef, veal, mutton, and pork—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WARNER: Petition of citizens of Rantoul, Ill., for the repeal of the tariff duties on beef, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON: Resolutions of Local Assembly 6909, Knights of Labor, Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of various citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., for the repeal of the tariff on beef, veal, mutton, and pork—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 30, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SPOONER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13246) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Chattahoochee River between Columbus, Ga., and Eufaula, Ala., or in the city of Columbus, Ga.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 14018) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KEAN. I present resolutions adopted at a meeting of Trenton Lodge, No. 38, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Trenton, N. J., relative to the anti-injunction bill; which I ask may be read.

The resolution was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

TRENTON, N. J., April 28, 1902.

HON. JOHN KEAN,
United States Senator.

HONORABLE SIR: Your careful attention is respectfully directed to the following resolutions adopted at a regular meeting of Trenton Lodge, No. 38, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, on Sunday, April 20, 1902:

Whereas the several railroad organizations, as representing the men in the railroad service in the United States, have, through their joint representative, Mr. H. R. Fuller, supported and urged the passage of Senate bill 1118, known as the "Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill;" and

Whereas by some influence at this time unknown to your petitioners the Committee on the Judiciary has reported out a bill known as Senate bill No. 4553, as a substitute, and which not only defeats the ends sought in the original measure, but which would bring new evils to bear upon our craft: Therefore, be it unanimously

Resolved by the officers and members of Trenton Lodge, No. 38, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, That we deprecate the act of this committee in ignoring the interests of labor, in placing in the hands of unscrupulous jurists an official sanction of the now unlawful and arbitrary use of the writ of injunction, which is always used by the servile, mercenary, corporation judge as a club with which to keep working men in subjection; and, be it further

Resolved, That we firmly believe that this substitution has been accomplished through the instrumentality of unfair discrimination, a thing in itself so despicable, that no representative of workmen seeking for their rights would for an instant stoop to it. Finally, be it

Resolved, That we want Senate bill No. 4553 defeated, and that we desire to have you urge the passage of the original measure—Senate bill No. 1118—in order that the rights of labor may be preserved.

Given under our hands and the seal of our lodge, in the city of Trenton, N. J., this 20th day of April, A. D. 1902.

[SEAL.]

U. M. CONWAY, Committee.

Attest:

W. M. CONWAY, Secretary.

Mr. KEAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rahway, N. J., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Jersey Central Division, No. 307, Order of Railway Conductors, of Somerville, and of Camden Division, No. 22, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Camden, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I present a joint resolution of the general assembly of Maryland, urging an appropriation to acquire and enlarge the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, and also a joint resolution of the general assembly of Maryland, relative to an appropriation for the completion of "inland waterways" connecting Chincoteague Bay and the Delaware Bay. I ask that the joint resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the joint resolutions have already been printed in the RECORD, having been presented yesterday by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS].

Mr. WELLINGTON. Then I ask that the joint resolutions may be simply noted in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. WELLINGTON presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a liberal system of reciprocity with Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

He also presented petitions of Lodge No. 432, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Baltimore; of Lodge No. 214, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Baltimore, and of Carriage and Wagon Workers' Local Union No. 83, American Federation of Labor, of Baltimore, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude Chinese laborers from the United States and their insular possessions; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Lodge No. 214, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Baltimore; of Lodge No. 432, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Baltimore; of the Local Union of Fredericktown; of Brewery Workers' Local Union No. 105, of Hagerstown; of Sheet Metal Workers' Local Union No. 122, of Baltimore, and of Retail Clerks' Local Union No. 22, of Cumberland, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of the Audubon Society of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation for the protection of game in Alaska, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the internal-revenue law relative to the tax on distilled spirits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Court Sunset Cox, No. 125, Foresters of America, of New York City, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Parlor City Lodge, No. 36, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Binghamton; of Elmira Division, No. 9, Order of Railway Conductors, of Elmira; of Buffalo Division, No. 2, Order of Railway Conductors, of Buffalo; of D. Hopkins Lodge, No. 1, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Oneonta, and of Northern Central Lodge, No. 413, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Elmira, all in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of Colonel A. Howard Fleming Lodge of Brotherhood Trainmen, of Fairmont, W. Va., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the adoption of a substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HARRIS presented a petition of the Kansas State Millers' Association, of Wichita, Kans., praying for the ratification of certain reciprocity treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DRYDEN presented petitions of Lodge No. 11, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Phillipsburg; of Local Division No. 85, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, of Trenton, and of Local Division No. 312, Order of Railway Conductors, of Weehawken, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the adoption of any substitute therefor; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of Verona Lodge, No. 182, International Association of Machinists, of Verona, Pa., and a petition of Iron and Steel Workers' Local Union No. 9249, of Pottstown, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of Lieutenant William Allison Post, No. 196, of Duncannon; of Post No. 157, of Pittsburg; of Gettysburg Circle, No. 188, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Gettysburg; of Henry Metcalf Post, No. 431, of Port Allegheny; of M. C. Lowry Post, No. 124, of Meyersdale, and of Kenady Post,